

LONDON :
Printed by SPOTTISWOODE & CO.
New-street Square.

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

APRIL, 1857.

No. CCXIV.

ART. I. — *History of Greece.* By GEORGE GROTE, Esq.
Vol. XII. London: 1856.

MR. GROTE has fixed the conclusion of his great work at an earlier point than we could have wished. It is indeed that which he selected at the beginning of his labours; but we had hoped, and we have in former articles expressed the hope, that he might be induced to reconsider his determination, and not to lay down his pen till he had traced the history of Grecian freedom to its final overthrow. As it is, he contents himself with tracing the decline of Athenian independence down to the lowest pitch of degradation. The historian of the great democracy cannot be induced to extend his labours into time when Athens vanishes into political insignificance, and when the main interest of the drama circles around monarchical Macedonia and federal Achaia. His contempt for the 'Greece of Polybius,' we must confess, surprises us. The Greece of Polybius is indeed very inferior to the Greece of Thucydides; but it is still Greece, still living Greece, Greece still free and republican. It was indeed but a recovered freedom which it enjoyed, a freedom less perfect, less enduring, than that of the elder time; but it was still, as Pausanias calls it, a new shoot from the old trunk.* But Mr. Grote has turned away with something of disdain from a subject which we think is worthy of him, and

* "Οτε δὴ καὶ μόγας, ἅτ. ἐκ δένδρου λεωβημένου καὶ εὐθὺ τὰ πλείονα, ἀνεβλάστησεν ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος τὸ Ἀχαικόν, vii. 17. 2. Mr. Grote himself quotes the passage, xii. 527.

which we are certain that no other man living is so competent to treat. Excellently as it has been dealt with by Bishop Thirlwall, there was still something to be added from Mr. Grote's own special point of view. No one could have so well compared the Achaian institutions with those of earlier, and of later commonwealths. It is therefore with regret that we find Mr. Grote conclude his *History of Greece* with no more than a passing and contemptuous reference to the rise and development of the Achaian League. (Vol. xii. p. 528.)

With regard to the Macedonian aspect of the subject, we must confess that we entertain a different opinion. Mr. Grote is admirably qualified to be the historian of Achaia; he is not equally qualified to be the historian of Macedonia. Indeed, in the present volume and that immediately preceding it, he has given us a history of Macedonia in its most brilliant period, which we cannot but look upon as the least satisfactory portion of his noble work. Mr. Grote will, we trust, pardon us if we deal with him with some plainness of speech. His history is so extensive that some points fairly open to discussion could not fail to occur in it. He propounds so much that is new and startling, that he must be prepared for a certain amount of dissent even among admirers who study him in his own spirit. And we ourselves have so often expressed our admiration for his general treatment of his subject, we have borne such full and willing testimony to the permanent benefits which Mr. Grote has conferred upon historical literature, that we have fairly earned the right to controvert any special point, however important. Such a special point of controversy we find in his treatment of the history of Macedonia, and especially of its greatest sovereign. From Mr. Grote's view of *Alexander the Great*, we respectfully but very widely dissent, and our present object is to set forth our reasons for so dissenting.

Mr. Grote has many claims on the gratitude of the historical student; but it is as the historian of the Athenian democracy that his claims are highest and most enduring. In that character he has won abiding fame. He has grappled with popular errors; he has put forth truths which, but for the weighty arguments with which he has supported them, would have been at once set aside as paradoxes. He has justified ostracism; he has found something to say for Cleon; he has shown that, even in the condemnation of Socrates though the people erred and erred deeply, yet their error was natural and almost pardonable. Demos is the darling of his affections; he watches him from his cradle, and forsakes him only when he has sunk into a second

childhood from which no Sausage-seller on earth could revive him. Now it was by Macedonian hands that this cherished object was trampled down, degraded, corrupted, well nigh erased from the list of independent states. That Mr. Grote should not be perfectly fair to Macedonia and Macedonians is only an inevitable result of the constitution of human nature. And, even here, he presents a most honourable contrast to another great writer who participates in the same view of the subject. Niebuhr's lectures on the age of Philip and Alexander are conceived simply in the spirit of the too famous oration of Callisthenes.* Everything Macedonian is only mentioned to be vilified. Every recorded scandal against Alexander is eagerly seized upon, without regard to the evidence on which it rests. Even for actions which the whole world has hitherto been content to admire, Niebuhr is always ready to assign some unworthy motive. And all is put forth with overbearing dogmatism, on the mere *ipse dixit* of Barthold Niebuhr. Very different is the conduct of Mr. Grote. Even here his laborious honesty never fails him. Mr. Grote does not refuse, even to a Macedonian, the privilege, no less Macedonian than Athenian, of being heard before he is condemned. The evidence is, as ever with Mr. Grote, fully and fairly marshalled; the reader who has not gone through the original authorities for himself is put in a position to dissent, if he pleases, from the decision of the judge. Hardly ever does Mr. Grote fail to bring forward the passages which tell most strongly against his own view. He believes much against Alexander which we hold that the evidence does not warrant; but he never invents scandal or attributes motives after the manner of Niebuhr.† Niebuhr is simply incapable of under-

* Οὐ τῆς δεινότητος ὁ Καλλισθένης, ἀλλὰ τῆς δυσμενείας Μακεδόσιν ἀποτίθει δέωκε. (Plut. Alex. 53.)

† Take for example the following instances of Niebuhr's extreme and even absurd unfairness: 'In theatrical historians [Arrian to wit, vi. 26.], we read the moving tale of the water which a soldier brought to Alexander, and how he poured it out in order to show them that he would share all his sufferings with them. I suspect it was with Alexander as it was with another great general, who ate a piece of coarse bread, but is said to have had a delicate morsel concealed in it.' (*Lect. on Anc. Hist.* vol. ii. p. 413, Eng. Tr.) What did Alexander conceal, and how did he conceal it?

In the same spirit he tells us (in the preceding page) that Alexander passed through the Gedrosian desert 'from hatred to his army and a wish to punish them for their resistance.' His repentance for the murder of Cleitus — very differently told by Mr. Grote —

standing a hero; Mr. Grote merely fails to raise himself to the heroic point of fully appreciating an enemy. With Niebuhr, Alexander becomes a monster instead of a man; with Mr. Grote he becomes at the worst a barbarian instead of a Greek. In short, Niebuhr is, in this case, a mere reckless calumniator; Mr. Grote is simply one who, after weighing a mass of conflicting authorities, has come to a conclusion less favourable to Alexander of Macedon than we ourselves have done after weighing the same authorities.

Of the life of Alexander we have five consecutive narratives, besides numerous allusions and fragments scattered up and down various Greek and Latin writers. Of these last, the greatest in number and the most curious in detail are to be found in the strange miscellany of Athenæus; but perhaps the most really valuable are due to the judicious and accurate Strabo. Of our five chroniclers, Arrian and Quintus Curtius have written separate histories of the great conqueror. The work of Arrian has come down to us entire, with the exception of a single lacuna: Curtius has several such gaps, and the whole of the two first books are wanting. Plutarch has devoted to Alexander one of his longest biographies; Diodorus bestows on him a whole book of his universal history; Justin gives a more succinct narrative in his epitome of Trogus Pompeius. But we have again to regret a very considerable lacuna in the narrative of Diodorus, which however is partially supplied by the headings of the chapters being preserved.

Here, it might be thought, are authorities enough; but unluckily, among all the five, there is not a single contemporary chronicler. All five write at secondhand, the earliest of them about three centuries after Alexander's death. The value of all, it is clear, must depend upon the faithfulness with which they represent the original documents, and upon the amount of critical power which they may have brought to bear upon their examination. Unluckily again, among all the five, only one has any pretensions to the name of a critic. Arrian alone appears to have combined the will and power to exercise a discreet judgment upon the statements of his predecessors.

becomes 'a mere farce and piece of acting' (p. 407.); finally, we almost blush to write it, his friendship for Hephestion is described as 'an unnatural affection' (p. 405.). For the miserably weak grounds on which this slander is built, we may refer to Ste. Croix, p. 384., and, for a parallel fiction, to Macaulay's 'History of England,' vol. iv. p. 596. But argument or parallel is hardly needed. The shades of Achilles and Patroclus, of Jonathan and David, might rise to rebuke the perpetrator of so infamous a calumny.

Diodorus we believe to be perfectly honest, but he is, at the same time, impenetrably stupid. Plutarch, as he himself tells us, does not write history, but lives; his object is to recount anecdotes, rather to point a moral than to give a formal narrative of political and military events. Justin is a feeble and careless epitomizer. Quintus Curtius is, in our eyes, little better than a romance-writer; he is the only one of the five whom we should suspect of any wilful departure from the truth.

The contemporary historians of Alexander's exploits were extremely numerous, but most of them seem to have been of very inferior character. His own generation produced no Thucydides, and the succeeding one no Herodotus. Both Arrian and Strabo* constantly complain of the discrepancies in their statements, and of the manner in which most of them trifled with their subject. They tell us of their wild fables, their gross exaggerations, their constant sacrifice of truth to effect. Cleitarchus, Onesicritus, Hegesias, the unfortunate Callisthenes, all have a very bad reputation among later writers. Even Chares of Mytilene, though an author of higher character, has handed down to us some very questionable statements. Some seem to have been deliberate liars†; others were perhaps nothing worse than dreaming pedants, whose accounts of military and political affairs seemed ridiculous to practical men like Polybius and Arrian.

Of our existing guides, Diodorus and Curtius evidently drew to a great extent from the same sources, but they do not often quote their authorities. Of these two, Diodorus, we have no doubt, honestly repeated what he found in his books, as far as he understood it; but he had not the slightest critical power to judge between one statement and another. In fact, as we find from his narrative of times when we are better able to test him, he could not always grasp the meaning of a plain story when it was set before him. Curtius, whoever he was and whenever he lived, was a man of far higher powers. Like Livy, he tells his tale to perfection as a mere matter of rhe-

* Οὐδὲ τοῖς περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου δὲ συγγράψουσιν ῥάδιον πιστεύειν τοῖς πολλοῖς, κ.τ.λ. Strabo, xi. 6. (Tauch. vol. ii. p. 424.) Δηλοῦσι δὲ μάλιστα τοῦτο οἱ τὰς Ἀλεξάνδρου πράξεις ἀναγράφαντες, προστιθέντες μὲν πολὺ καὶ τὸ τῆς κολακείας εἶδος· xvii. 1. (vol. iii. p. 459.)

† Such at least seems to have been Strabo's judgment of Onesicritus, xv. 1. (vol. iii. p. 269.) Ὀνησίκριτος· ὃν οὐκ Ἀλεξάνδρου μᾶλλον ἢ τῶν παραδόξων ἀρχικυβερνήτην προσείποι τις ἂν· πάντες μὲν γὰρ οἱ περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου τὸ θαυμαστὸν ἀντὶ τάληθους ἀπεδέχοντο μᾶλλον· ὑπερβιάσασθαι δὲ δοκεῖ τοὺς τοιούτους ἐκείνος τῇ τερατολογίᾳ.

toric. But then rhetoric is all that he has to give us; his constant sacrifice of everything to oratorical display; his palpable blunders in history and geography; his manifest exaggerations; his love of the wonderful and the horrible wherever he can find them; all show that he represents the most extravagant and inaccurate of the earlier writers, and even suggest the idea that a great deal actually proceeds from his own imagination. In fact, in reading Curtius, we feel that we are already on the road to the wild romance of the pseudo-Callisthenes, and to the yet stranger imaginings of the oriental historians. It is dangerous in the extreme to accept any statement on his solitary testimony.*

The object of Plutarch, as we have already stated, was anecdote or biography rather than history. He may therefore fairly be judged by a less severe standard than any of the other writers. And certainly, of the two, we look far more favourably upon the anecdotes of Plutarch than upon the marvels of Curtius. We are far from accepting them *en masse* as literal facts. Anecdotes are easy to invent and easier to improve; indeed the man is a sort of martyr to veracity who can resist the temptation of making a good story still better. But, for an anecdote to pass current at all, it must possess a kind of truth. It must have a certain degree of probability, and must at least be such as might have happened, even if it did not actually happen. Stories of this sort may therefore generally be accepted as throwing light upon the character of the persons introduced. Plutarch, again, is far more valuable than Curtius or Diodorus, from his frequent references to his authorities. Among these he often refers to one source of information which would be the highest of all, could we only be assured of its genuineness, namely, the private letters of Alexander himself. Of the documents claiming that character we should like to know more than we can find out from Plutarch's occasional quotations. It is well known that letters are easily forged, and that they were constantly forged in antiquity. We cannot therefore look upon these documents, which seem to have been unknown to Arrian †, with

* Curtius, we suspect, was capable of better things. He once, or twice (see ix. 5. 21.), affects criticism; he once really gives us a piece of it. There was a tale that Alexander once caused Lysimachus, the future king, to be exposed to a lion. Curtius acutely finds the origin of the fable in an encounter between Lysimachus and a lion at a hunting-party in Alexan. r's presence (viii. 4. 17.).

† Arrian indeed (vii. 23, 9.) refers to a letter from Alexander to Cleomenes, his satrap in Egypt; but he merely introduces its contents into his narrative, as if he had found the fact of its transmission

unhesitating confidence. At most they can only be regarded as one source of information among others.

Arrian, as he himself informs us, selected the two narratives of Ptolemy and Aristobulus as the groundwork of his own. Both, he tells us, were companions of Alexander; both wrote after his death, when they had nothing to hope or to fear from him; Ptolemy moreover was a king, in whom falsehood would be especially unlikely. We do not profess to share Arrian's ultra-royalism on this last head; but we think we can discern good reasons for placing Ptolemy among our most trustworthy authorities. On two occasions, when his name was honourably put forward by other writers—possibly his own flatterers—he himself disclaimed all merit. When Alexander received his famous wound among the Malli, Ptolemy, according to some statements, was one of those who first came to his assistance. According to Ptolemy himself, he was commanding another division of the army in another part of the country.* Similarly, according to Diodorus and Curtius, Ptolemy was once wounded by a poisoned arrow, and the means of relief were revealed to Alexander in a vision. As Arrian mentions nothing of the kind, we may infer that Ptolemy mentioned nothing either †: for the tale was one which, had it rested on any tolerable evidence, Arrian would not have been inclined to reject. Like Pausanias, Arrian was a devout pagan, and loved tales of omens and prodigies, which he occasionally relates at disproportionate length. But he is quite free from that general love of exaggerated and horrible stories which is so rife among the inferior writers. Doubtless what mainly determined his preference for the narratives of Ptolemy and Aristobulus was their sober and

recorded by Ptolemy or Aristobulus. Had he known and believed in the collection of epistles referred to by Plutarch, he would surely have placed them above either of his favourite authorities.

Bishop Thirlwall (vol. vii. p. 386.) argues in favour of the genuineness of one of the letters quoted by Plutarch, that it is 'placed beyond doubt by its direction [*Κρατερῶ καὶ Ἀράδῳ καὶ Ἀλέξανδρῳ*], 'which would not have occurred to a forger.' Surely this turns upon the skill and the means of information possessed by the forger.

Strabo (xv. l. vol. iii. p. 275., Tauchnitz) quotes a letter from Craterus to his mother, which may possibly belong to the same collection. Either the letter must have been a forgery, or Craterus must have been a most formidable liar. Strabo himself calls it, *ἐπιστολὴ πολλὰ τε ἄλλα παρὰ τὰ φησιν καὶ οὐκ ὁμολογούσα οὐδὲν*. It makes Alexander reach the Gangcs.

* Arrian, vi. 11.

† See Ste Croix, p. 409.

practical tone, as contrasted with the monstrous fables of Onesicritus and Cleitarchus.

We hold, then, that Arrian ought to be our chief guide; and yet we can concede to Mr. Grote that his silence does not always absolutely disprove a statement. But our reason is not quite the same as Mr. Grote's. The other writers frequently contain stories to the discredit of Alexander, which do not occur in Arrian. Mr. Grote infers that the other writers preserved the truth, which was concealed by Ptolemy and Aristobulus, in their zeal for Alexander's good name. Archdeacon Williams of Cardigan, on the other hand, will have it that the writers of what he calls 'republican Greece' did nothing but invent tales to the disparagement of the royal Macedonian. This phantasy has been tossed to the winds by the stronger hand of his Diocesan.* The mass of Greek writers, at all events of later Greek writers, certainly did not run down Alexander either as a king or as a Macedonian. They had become reconciled to kings, and had learned to regard Macedonians as Greeks. The chief vice attributed to them by Strabo, is not depreciation, but flattery and love of the marvellous. A most capacious appetite they do indeed display for the extravagant, the horrible, and the scandalous. Among all this Alexander of course comes in for his share; but so do his enemies likewise. Crimes are attributed to both which probably neither of them ever committed. But, on the other hand, it is not necessary to suppose that Ptolemy and Aristobulus were such formal apologists for Alexander, as Mr. Grote seems to take for granted. To suppose that they omitted the recital of Alexander's crimes, implies that they regarded them as crimes. But there is no reason for attributing to Ptolemy or Aristobulus a higher moral standard than to Alexander himself. If Alexander, as Mr. Grote believes†, massacred the Branchidæ as an act of piety, Ptolemy or Aristobulus would be quite as likely to applaud as to condemn the deed. If from zeal for Alexander's good name, they omitted the kiss publicly given by him to Bagoas ‡ in the

* Perhaps every one of Bishop Thirlwall's numerous sarcasms against Archdeacon Williams's 'Life of Alexander,' is strictly deserved. Yet the book, as a whole, is not so bad as might be supposed from the specimens thus embalmed. Among a good many blunders and a great deal of partiality, it exhibits some thought and research, and it is written in a peculiarly agreeable manner.

† Vol. xii. p. 275.

‡ See Plut. Alex. 67. (compare, on the other hand, c. 22.); Athen. xiii. 80. (p. 603.); compare, on the other hand, x. 45. (p. 435.). Compare also the counter story about Agesilaus, Xen. Ages. v. 4.

theatre, we must infer that their morals were sterner than those of the assembled Macedonians, Greeks, and Persians, who excited and applauded the action. It is far more probable that they omitted the one tale as untrue, the other, perhaps as untrue, certainly as trivial. Still, it must be admitted that the silence of Arrian is not necessarily conclusive against a statement. Arrian was himself a military man of some reputation, fond both of the theory and the practice of his art. His history therefore is primarily a military one, and he sometimes passes lightly over matters not bearing on military affairs. But both the assertions and the silence of Arrian afford strong *à priori* grounds of historical presumption, against which the statements of the other writers must be weighed at whatever they are worth.

It is no wonder then that, from such a mass of conflicting evidence, different minds should draw different conclusions, and that Alexander should appear quite another being to Mitford, Droysen, and Archdeacon Williams, and to Ste. Croix, Niebuhr, and Mr. Grote. Among these, Droysen and Niebuhr form the two extremes on either side, for blind and often unfair idolatry, and for still more blind and unfair depreciation. Above them all, the serene intellect of Bishop Thirlwall holds the judicial balance. He can sympathise with the fall of Athenian freedom without denying the common rights of humanity to its destroyers. He can reverence Lycurgus and Demosthenes, and yet behold a hero in Alexander, and not an unmitigated monster even in Philip. He can understand how a man exposed to the most fearful of temptations may sink into frequent faults and occasional crimes, and yet retain a heart sound at its core. He will not deny to such an one, though the author of much incidental misery, his claim to be ranked among the benefactors of mankind. The more we peruse Bishop Thirlwall's narrative of this period, the more disposed are we to recognise in it the nearest approach to the perfection of critical history. The acute appreciation, the calm balancing of evidence, the deep knowledge of human nature, the clear and vigorous narrative, the eloquent and feeling conclusion with which he sums up the character of the conqueror, would alone suffice to place their author in the very first rank of historical writers. In his treatment of the internal affairs of Athens in earlier times, Mr. Grote far outshines Bishop Thirlwall; but in no respect does he equal, or even approach, the Bishop's admirable narrative of the period from the accession of Philip to the death of Demetrius Poliorcetes. It is therefore on the whole the Alexander of Thirlwall, rather than the Alex-

ander either of Grote or of Droysen, who deserves to live in the recollection of mankind and to challenge the admiration of the world.

The first great fact of Alexander's history is, that a King of the Macedonians overthrew the Persian empire, in the character of Captain-general of Hellas, and in the name of Hellenic vengeance for wrongs inflicted by the barbarians of a past generation. The second is, that when he had accomplished this work, he began to identify himself with the empire which he had overthrown, that he assumed the character of King of Asia, that he entered upon a series of conquests in which neither Greece nor Macedonia had either real or sentimental interest, and was cut off while engaged in the organisation of a world-wide dominion of which both Greece and Macedonia would have been, in geographical extent, simply insignificant corners. In contemplating such a career, its hero must be judged by the standard of his own times; and not by considerations, whether moral or political, which are either purely Christian or purely modern. Alexander cannot be rendered amenable to a higher standard, except by a view which is of itself the greatest homage to him—namely, that he was a man of such greatness as to belong to all time, one who might reasonably be expected to forestall the progress of future generations. Alexander simply was, however, a heathen Greek warrior of the fourth century before Christ. It is enough if his career, allowing for his special circumstances and temptations, be found to be not less honourable than that of Agesilaus or Epaminondas. Mr. Grote, who regards Alexander not as a Greek but as a barbarian, should, in fairness, judge him by a standard still less strict, and should not condemn him if he attains the measure of the better class of Persian rulers, of the first Darius, of the elder or the younger Cyrus.

Nothing would be easier than to depict in glowing language the misery which must have been the immediate result of Alexander's conquests, and to lament that the lives of countless thousands should have been sacrificed to the insatiable ambition of a single man. But these are objections, not to Alexander, but to war in the abstract. The real questions are, Were the wars of Alexander unjust according to the principles of his own age? Were they carried on with any circumstances of cruelty or perfidy contrary to the laws of war then acknowledged?

The notions entertained, not only by Greek soldiers, but by

Greek philosophers also, as to the relations between Greek and barbarian, were of a nature not easy for modern Europe to conceive. They may be compared with those which Islam establishes between the true believer and the infidel. Between those two classes there is to be a constant holy war, modified only by the obligations which particular treaties, or rather truces, may impose. Anterior to such special engagements, the infidel has nothing to look for but slaughter or subjugation. Not dissimilar was the light in which, for some centuries at least, the Christians* of Europe regarded the pagan of Asia, Africa, and America. The old Greek considered the barbarian, unless protected by some special compact, as his natural foe and his natural slave. War between the two was looked upon as the regular order of things. And war, it should be remembered, even when waged by Greek against Greek, involved utter havoc and devastation. Fruit-trees were cut down, corn-fields were trampled, houses were destroyed, every species of wanton ravage was indulged in, not from the incidental necessities of a battle, but as the ordinary accompaniment of a march through a hostile country. Nothing but a special capitulation could even secure the life and freedom of the prisoner.* To slaughter the men and sell the women and children of a captured town was regarded indeed as severity, but as severity which occasion might justify, and which in no way violated the received laws of war. Judged by these principles, we shall hardly pronounce Alexander's attack on the Persian Empire to have been unjust in itself, and certainly not to have been carried out with undue severity in detail.

Long before Alexander was born, or before Macedonia attained to eminence, a pan-Hellenic expedition against Persia had been the day-dream alike of Greek statesmen and of Greek rhetoricians. It was the cherished vision of the long life of Isocrates. It had been contemplated by the Thessalian Tagos Jason. It had been actually commenced by the Spartan King Agesilaus. Probably Demosthenes himself would have made no objection to it on the score of abstract justice. In his view, it was untimely; it was impolitic; it was prejudicial to Athenian and even to Hellenic interests. Persia was no longer formidable, while Macedonia was formidable in the extreme. These arguments were conclusive against a pan-Hellenic attack on Persia under Macedonian headship. But there is no reason to suppose that such a warfare, under more favour-

* See Arnold, Thucydides, vol. i. p. 28.

able circumstances and with a less dangerous leader, would have offended any abstract moral instinct in any Athenian or Lacedæmonian statesman.

The question now arises, How far was Alexander entitled to put himself forward as the champion of united Hellas against the barbarian? According to Mr. Grote, Alexander himself was no Greek, but a mere barbarian or semi-barbarian, who had at most acquired some superficial tincture of Hellenic cultivation. He was a mere 'non-Hellenic conqueror,' almost as external as Darius or Xerxes. Instead of the champion, he was the destroyer, the tyrant, of independent Hellas. Grecian interests lay on the side of Persia, not of Macedonia. The victory of Alexander at Gaugamela produced substantially the same results as would have followed a victory of Xerxes at Salamis. In fact, if a cry of Hellenic liberty or Hellenic vengeance was to be raised, it was the despot of Pella, not the despot of Susa, against whom the national crusade ought to have been directed.

In all this there is much of truth. Indeed, the purely political portion of the theory is indisputable. It had been before put forth, with no perceptible difference, by Bishop Thirlwall. Archdeacon Williams, indeed, holds, with the Corinthian Demaratus, that the sight of Alexander on the throne of Darius 'must have been a source of the greatest pride and exultation to every Greek who possessed a single spark of national feeling.*' But even he perceives that the Macedonians at Issus 'conquered not the Persians alone, but the united efforts of Southern Greece and Persia.'† Undoubtedly Grecian interests, in the narrower sense, lay on the Persian, and not on the Macedonian side. A Persian victory at Gaugamela would have been almost as precious for the political liberties of Athens as was a Persian defeat at Marathon. The old Greek system of independent city-commonwealths was in no wise threatened by Persia; it was something more than threatened by Macedonia. We see this now; Athenian and Spartan statesmen saw it at the time. It was natural that every Athenian patriot should see a friend in his old enemy the Great King, a foe and an oppressor in the self-styled champion of Greece. Nor is it unnatural that the modern champion of Athenian freedom should see the whole matter from an Athenian point of view, and should regard the claims of Alexander to Hellenic championship as mere mockery and pretence. But

* Life of Alexander, p. 176.

† Ibid. p. 111.

all this by no means proves that there was not another aspect of the question, which might be fairly taken, and which actually was taken, both by Alexander himself and by a large portion of the Greek nation.

The exact ethnical relation between the Greek and the Macedonian people is a difficult question, and one on which we need not here enter. Very different statements proceed from different authorities. Alexander assumes Macedonia to be indisputably part of Greece.* Demosthenes counts Philip not only as no Greek, but as among the vilest of barbarians.† Both these statements are clearly interested exaggerations in opposite directions. The Macedonian was certainly not strictly a Greek, yet neither was he strictly a barbarian‡; he had at least faculties for adopting Greek culture, which were not shared by the Persian or the Egyptian. Throughout the campaigns of Alexander we always feel that Greeks and Macedonians, whatever the amount of difference among themselves, form one class as opposed to the mere Asiatic barbarian. It is not merely that they were fighting under the same banners, — so were Greek and barbarian on the opposite side — it is that both display those particular military qualities which have always distinguished the European from the Asiatic, and of which the Greek had hitherto been the great example. The Macedonian, in short, if not a born Greek, became a naturalised one. He was the first-fruits of that artificial Greek nation which was to play so important a part in later times, and whose nationality still remains vigorous and progressive in our own day. Indeed, from the highest Hellenic type at Athens the descent is extremely gradual down to the non-Hellenic or semi-Hellenic Epeirots and Macedonians. The latter were surely not so inferior to the Greek of Ætolia or Thessaly as the Greek of Ætolia or Thessaly was to the Greek of Athens. The few vestiges which exist of the old Macedonian language point to a speech not strictly Greek, but still closely allied to Greek. It may even have been no farther removed from Attic purity than was the speech of the wild Ætolians.§ And at all events, Greek

* Μακεδονίαν καὶ τὴν ἄλλην Ἑλλάδα. (Arrian, ii. 14.)

† οὐ μόνον οὐχ Ἕλληνας οὐτὸς οὐδὲ προσήκοντος οὐδὲν ποτε Ἕλλησιν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ βαρβάρου ἐντεῦθεν ὅθεν καλὸν εἰπεῖν, ἀλλ' ὀλέθρου Μακεδόνας, κ.τ.λ. Dem. Phil. iii. 40. (p. 119.)

‡ 'Greeks, Macedonians, Barbarians' occur as three distinct classes, not only in Arrian (ii. 7., iv. 11.) but in Isocrates, Philip. 178. So Plutarch, Alex. 47. Cf. 51.

§ "Οπερ [Εὐρυπᾶνες] μέγιστον μέρος ἐστὶ τῶν Λιτωλῶν, ἀγνωστότατοι δὲ γλῶσσαν καὶ ὠμοφάγοι εἰσιν, ὡς λέγονται. (Thuc. iii. 94.)

of respectable purity soon became the sole tongue of government, literature, and business. A nation which could so easily identify itself with the language, manners, and religion of Greece cannot be looked upon as a horde of alien barbarians like the Persian invaders. Nor was the Macedonian adoption of Greek manners merely analogous to their partial adoption by the Roman conquerors. The Roman always retained his separate national being and national dominion. He never regarded himself as a Greek or disused the language of Latium. But the Macedonian sunk his distinct nationality in that of his subjects. He was content with the position of the dominant Greek among other Greeks.

But whatever the Macedonian people were, the Macedonian kings were undoubtedly Hellenic. Isocrates delights to depict the willing subjection of Macedonia to its Greek rulers as one of the noblest tributes to the inherent superiority of the Greek.* In much earlier times the judges of Olympia had recognised another Alexander as a Greek, an Argive, a Heracleid. In the veins of the son of Philip and Olympias the blood of Hercules was mingled with the blood of Achilles. Not only Philip, but earlier Macedonian kings, had laboured, not without effect, to introduce among their subjects the civilisation of their own race. Philip himself first appears to the south of Olympus not as a barbarian conqueror, but as the champion of Apollo, chosen by the Amphictyonic Synod to lead the armies of the God against the sacrilegious Phocian. His services were rewarded by the admission of himself and his successors as members of the great religious council of Greece. From that moment Macedonia is clearly entitled to rank as a Greek state.

The object of Philip clearly was not to Macedonize Hellas, but to Hellenize Macedonia. Macedonia was recognised as a Greek state; the next step was to make it the imperial Greek state. The supremacy, the *ἡγεμονία*, of Greece, so often contended for between her principal cities, was to be asserted by the King of the Macedonians, not as a foreign invader, but by virtue of his Hellenic position as chief of the most powerful of Greek states. By the confederacy of Corinth, Macedonia was invested with the same supremacy which, after the battle of Ægos Potamos, and again after the peace of Antalcidas, had been possessed by Sparta. The existence of such a supremacy was in both cases repugnant to Greek political instincts, and in both cases it led to much practical oppression. But we have

no reason to suppose that the supremacy of Macedonia was at all more oppressive than the supremacy of Sparta. Demosthenes, or rather some contemporary orator under his name*, has drawn a sufficiently dark picture of Macedonian rule, but hardly so dark a picture as Isocrates had previously drawn of Spartan rule†. Philip and Alexander do not seem to have systematically interfered with the governments of the Greek cities‡. Athens, under the supremacy of Sparta, was subjected to the tyranny of the Thirty. Under the supremacy of Macedonia, she retained her democracy, and listened to Demosthenes pleading for the crown. In Asia, Lysander everywhere set up oligarchies§; Alexander, in several instances at least, restored democracies||. We need not infer that he was an enthusiast for popular rights, but he at least had not that abstract hatred of freedom which has actuated so many monarchs. The supremacy of Philip and Alexander was naturally obnoxious to great cities like Thebes, Athens, and Sparta, which aspired to a similar supremacy of their own. But we can hardly doubt that many of the smaller states hailed them as deliverers, and gave their votes in the synod of Corinth with hearty good will.

The grand difference between the Macedonian supremacy and the earlier supremacy of Athens, Thebes, or Sparta consists in this — that those states were republics, while Macedonia was a monarchy. Mr. Grote seems to argue that Philip and Alexander could not be Greeks, because they were kings.¶ In another place** he far more truly represents Alexander as being, in many respects, a resuscitation of the Homeric Greek. But the Homeric Greek was surely a Greek and not a barbarian; one main difference between Greece and Macedonia was that Macedonia had retained the old heroic royalty which Greece had rejected. Such was the case with Molossis also, the land of

* See the oration *Περὶ τῶν πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον συνθηκῶν* throughout.

† *Paneg.* 144. *et seq.* *Panath.* 57. *et seq.* &c.

‡ In two cases, that of Messene and of the Achaian Pellene, Alexander is accused (*Dem. περὶ τῶν πρὸς Ἀ.* 5. 12., *Pausanias*, viii. 7. 27.) of forestalling the policy of his successors and establishing a tyrant in a Grecian city. But these acts seem to stand quite alone. Elsewhere we find him (*Arrian*, v. 25.) expressing admiration for the aristocratical constitutions which he found established in some Indian states. Probably he would favour whatever form of government best suited his policy in each particular case.

§ See *Isoc. Panath.* 58.

|| *Arrian*, ii. 17, 18.; ii. 5.

¶ *Vol.* xii. p. 3.

** *Vol.* xii. p. 95.

Alexander's maternal ancestors, a state exactly analogous to Macedonia, where Greeks of heroic descent reigned over a people at most only semi-Hellenic. Molossis, like Macedonia, became Greek; indeed it went a step farther than Macedonia, and became a democratic republic.

We hold, then, that Alexander is fully entitled to all the honours of the Hellenic name, though his sympathies may well have lain more warmly with the heroic Greeks of the Homeric age than with the republican Greeks of his own day. Yet he did not appear among the latter as a barbarian conqueror. It was his ambition to attack the barbarian as the chosen champion of Hellas, and that position was formally conferred upon him, with the outward consent of all*, and doubtless with the real good will of many. As such, he crosses over to Asia, overthrows the Persian monarchy, and solemnly destroys the palace of the Persian kings in revenge for the devastations committed by Xerxes in Greece. The championship of Hellas is, at least during this period of his life, always prominently put forward, and who has the right to say that it was hypocritically put forward? The inscription on his votive offering is, 'Alexander the son of Philip, and the Greeks, the Lacedæmonians excepted, from the Barbarians who inhabit Asia.†' The place selected for the offering is not Dion or Pella, but the Acropolis of Athens. In his passage through Grecian Asia, he proclaims himself as a Grecian liberator, and, as we have seen, restores to the Grecian cities their democratic freedom. If he deals harshly with Greeks in the Persian service, it is because they have transgressed the common decree of the nation‡; and he carefully § distinguishes between those who have enlisted before and those who have enlisted after his recognition as pan-Hellenic Captain-general. ||

* Arrian, i. 1. 'Sparta alone refused.'

† Arrian, i. 16.

‡ Arrian, i. 16. 29.; iii. 23.

§ Arrian, iii. 24.

|| Mr. Grote, somewhat strangely to our mind, compares Alexander's relation to the Greek Confederacy with Napoleon's relation to the Confederation of the Rhine (vol. xii. p. 70.). He quotes an instance of the distinction made by Napoleon, in his Russian campaign, between native Russians and Germans in the Russian service. The former were honourable enemies doing their duty; the latter were his own rebellious subjects, whom he might deal with as traitors. This, Mr. Grote tells us, is analogous to Alexander's treatment of the Greeks in the Persian service. But, to make the analogy good for anything, Napoleon should have proclaimed himself as a German, the chosen

Undoubtedly the mercenary Greeks who fought for the Great King against that pan-Hellenic Captain-general were in reality fighting the battles of Hellas. So would mercenary Greeks retained by Persia against Agesilaus have been fighting the battles, perhaps of Hellas, at any rate of Thebes and of Athens. But they fought the battles of Hellas in an indirect and underhand manner; and one can hardly attribute to them the same feelings of Hellenic patriotism as to the men who fought openly for Greece against Macedon at Chæroneia and at Crannon. The show and sentiment of Hellenic nationality must have been throughout on the side of Alexander. An Athenian patriot lamenting the degradation of his own once imperial city, indeed a keen-sighted politician in any Grecian city, might wish well to Darius and ill to Alexander, as many of the French *émigrés* and some of the friends of liberty in 1814 supported the cause of the Allies against the cause of Napoleon. But the spectacle of a hero-king, the descendant of the most venerated names in Grecian legend, devoting himself to avenge the old wrongs of Greece upon the barbarian, must have been a seduction difficult to resist. Alexander, at least, fully believed in his own mission; and such of his Macedonians as adopted any Hellenic position at all, would, with the usual zeal of new converts, be even more susceptible of such influences than the Greeks themselves.

Nor does Alexander's conduct within Greece itself, at all events during the earlier portion of his reign, at all belie these pretensions. The destruction of Thebes was indeed an awful blow, but it was a blow in no wise more awful than Hellenic cities had often suffered at each other's hands. As far as human misery was concerned, the vengeance of Alexander upon Thebes was less extreme than that of Athens upon Scione and Melos. The fate of Thebes, again, was referred by Alexander to his own Greek allies, to Platæans and Orchomenians, whose own cities had been overthrown by Thebes in her day of might, and who now hastened with delight to execute vengeance upon their oppressor. What appeared so specially awe-striking in the fate of

head of Germany, the Germanizer of France, the invader of Russia to avenge German wrongs. Alexander did not say that the Greek prisoners were his 'subjects,' as Napoleon did with the Germans. He said that they were 'Greeks, fighting against Greece, contrary to the common agreement of all the Greeks,' (*ἡδικεῖν γὰρ μέγαλα τοὺς στρατευομένους ἐνάντια τῇ Ἑλλάδι, παρὰ τοῖς βαρβάροις, παρὰ τὰ δόγματα τὰ Ἑλλήνων*. Arrian, iii. 23., so also i. 16.)

Thebes was not the mere amount of misery inflicted, but, as Mr. Grote says (vol. xii. p. 57.), the violation of Hellenic sentiment in the destruction of so great a city, one of such historical and legendary fame, and the danger of offending local gods and heroes by the cessation of their accustomed local worship. Had Alexander merely expelled or enslaved the existing Thebans, and had handed over the walls and temples to a new Theban community, formed out of his own Greek allies, but little would have been said of his cruelty. As it was, the destruction of Thebes was held to follow him through life. The native city of Dionysus was overthrown, and the destroyer was amenable to the vengeance of the patron-god. He paid the penalty in the death of Cleitus, and in the refusal of his army to advance beyond the Hyphasis.* But, even in earlier days, he repented of the act, and endeavoured to make amends by showing special kindness to such Thebans as the accidents of war threw in his way.†

Against severity to Thebes we may, in the case both of Philip and Alexander, set generosity towards Athens. Both of them, it is evident, entertained a feeling of reverence for the intellectual mistress of Hellas. Such a feeling was likely to be far stronger in Macedonians who had adopted Grecian culture than in contemporary Spartans or Thebans, to whom Athens was merely an ordinary enemy or ally. Athens was a political adversary both to Philip and to Alexander; both of them humbled her so far as policy required; but neither of them ever thought of those acts of coercion and vengeance to which they resorted in the case of Thebes. When Thebes received a garrison from Philip, Athens was only required to surrender her foreign possessions. When Thebes was levelled with the ground by Alexander, Athens was only required to surrender her obnoxious orators, and even that demand was not finally pressed.‡ As we have seen, Alexander's first barbarian spoils were

* Plut. Alex. 13.

† Arrian, ii. 15.

‡ Mr. Grote (vol. xii. p. 63.) has a note on the details connected with Alexander's demand for the extradition of the orators, into which we need not enter. But we may mention thus much. Mr. Grote says, —

‘I think it highly improbable that the Athenians would by public vote express their satisfaction that Alexander had punished the Thebans for their revolt. If the Macedonising party at Athens was strong enough to carry so ignominious a vote, they would also have been strong enough to carry the subsequent proposition of Phokion, — that the ten citizens demanded should be surrendered.’

But surely it is one thing to pass a vote which, however ignomi-

dedicated in Athenian temples; from the captured palace of the Great King, he restored to Athens the statues of her tyrannicides. Even the anecdote recorded by Plutarch*, which represents Athenian praise as the chief object of his labours, exaggerated as it doubtless is, shows at least that the Macedonian conqueror, though his conquests might be incompatible with the political liberties of Athens, was in no way, in spirit or feeling, the foe of Athens or of Greece.

Three great battles and several great sieges made Alexander master of the Persian empire. And it is worth remark that the immediate results of the three battles, Granicus, Issus, and Gaugamela, coincide with permanent results in the history of the world. The victory of the Granicus made him master of Asia Minor, of a region which the course of a few centuries completely Hellenised, and which remained Greek, Christian, and Orthodox, down to the Turkish invasions of the eleventh century. The territory thus secured to Alexander, from the Danube to Mount Taurus, nearly corresponded with the extent of the Byzantine empire for several centuries, and might very possibly have been ruled by him, as it was in Byzantine times, from an European centre. The field of Issus gave him Syria and Egypt, regions which the Macedonian and the Roman retained for nearly a thousand years, and which for centuries contained, in Alexandria and Antioch, the two greatest of Grecian cities. But Syria and Egypt themselves never became Greek; when they became Christian, they failed to become Orthodox, and they fell away at the first touch of the victorious Saracen. Their government required an Asiatic or Egyptian capital, but their ruler might still have remained European and Hellenic. His third triumph at Gaugamela gave him the possession of the whole East; but it was but a momentary possession: he had now pressed onward into regions where neither Grecian culture, Roman dominion, nor Christian theology proved eventually able to strike root.

Mr. Grote remarks that Philip would probably have taken the advice of Parmenion, so contemptuously rejected by Alexander, and would have accepted the offer of Darius to cede the provinces west of the Euphrates. Alexander might well

nious, actually injured nobody, another to have never illustrious citizens to exile, captivity, or death. Doubtless the latter would be given for the one proposition, which would be refused to the other.

* Alex. 60. ὃ Ἀθηναῖοι, ἀπὸ γε πιστεύσαι' ἂν ἡλικίους ὑπομένω κινδύνους ἐνέειπ' ἡμῖν παρ' ὑμῖν εὐδοξίας. This is put into his mouth at the crossing of the Hydaspes, just before the great battle with Porus.

have done so also, could he have foreseen the future destiny which fixed that limit as the permanent boundary of European dominion in Asia. But the sentiment of Hellenic vengeance — we may add his personal spirit of adventure — was not satisfied with robbing Persia of her foreign possessions; he must overthrow Persia herself. Persian monarchs had taken tribute of Macedonia, and had devastated Greece; Greek and Macedonian must now march in triumph into the very home of the enemy. As Xerxes had sat in state by the ruins of Athens, so must the Captain-general of Hellas stand in the guise of the Avenger over the blackened ruins of Persepolis. But the conquest of Persia at once changed the whole position of the conqueror. The whole realm of the Achæmenidæ could neither be at once hellenised, nor yet converted into a dependency of Macedon. The limited King of the Macedonians, the elective Captain-general of Greece, was driven to assume to himself the position of the Great King, and to reign on the throne of Cyrus as his legitimate successor, and not as a foreign intruder.

Here was the rock upon which Alexander's whole scheme of conquest split. He had gone too far; yet his previous position was one which would hardly have allowed him to stop sooner. Till he crossed the Persian Gates, he had appeared rather as a deliverer than as an enemy to the native inhabitants of all the lands through which he passed. The Greek cities of Asia welcomed a conqueror of their own race, a king who did not scruple to restore to them their democratical freedom. Even to the barbarian inhabitants of Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt, he might well appear as a deliverer. A change of masters is commonly acceptable to subject nations; and a Greek might be fairly expected to make a better master than a Persian. Against Phœnicians, Egyptians, Babylonians, Alexander had no mission of vengeance; he might rather call them to aid him against the common foe. If they had served in the army of Xerxes, so had his own Heracleid ancestors.* If the deities of Attica had been wronged and insulted, so had those of Memphis and of Babylon. In Western Asia, therefore, Alexander met with but little strictly native opposition,

* Mr. Grote would seem (vol. xii. p. 56.), to imply that this fact invalidated Alexander's claim to avenge the Persian invasion, at all events that it deprived him of all right to reproach Thebes with her share in it. But the earlier Alexander, in following Xerxes, only bowed to the same compulsion as all Northern Greece; and it is clear that his heart was on the side of Athens, while Thebes served the barbarian with hearty good will.

except from those fierce tribes which had here and there maintained their independence against the Persian, and had as little mind to surrender it to the Macedonian. But at last he reached Persia itself; he entered the royal city, where the Great King reigned, not, as at Susa and Babylon, as a foreign conqueror, but as the chief of his own people, in the hearth and cradle of his empire. He saw the palace of the barbarian arrayed with the spoils of Greece; he opened his treasure-house rich with the tribute of many Grecian cities, and of his own once subject kingdom. The destruction of the Persepolitan palace might well appear as an impressive act of symbolical vengeance, a costly sacrifice to the offended gods of Greece and Macedonia, of Babylon and Syria and Egypt.

But this impressive scene at Persepolis was the last exhibition of Alexander in the character of Hellenic avenger. Not long afterwards, the fortunate crime of Bessus transferred to the invader all the advantages, without any of the criminality, of the murder of Darius. From this moment Alexander appears as the Great King, the successor of Cyrus. On his change of position naturally followed many changes in other respects. He began to demand the same outward marks of homage as had been shown to his predecessors, a homage which, according to Greek and Macedonian notions, was degrading, if not idolatrous. We are free to admit that from this time the character of Alexander becomes deteriorated; that his head was in some degree turned by success; that his passions, always impetuous, now became violent*; that, in short, with the position of an eastern despot, he began to share a despot's feelings, and occasionally to be hurried into a despot's crimes.

His position now was a strange one. He had advanced too far for his original objects. Permanent possession of his conquests beyond the Tigris could only be retained in the character of King of the Medes and Persians. Policy prompted him to assume that character. We can also fully believe that he was himself really dazzled with the splendour of his superhuman success. His career had been such as to realise the wildest dreams which he could have cherished either in his waking or his sleeping moments. The Great King, the type of earthly splendour and happiness, had fallen before him; he himself was now the Great King; he was lord of an empire wider than Grecian imagination had attributed to any mortal; he was master of wealth which in Grecian eyes might enable its

* ἦν γὰρ δὴ ὀξύτερος ἐν τῇ τότε, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς βαρβαρικῆς θραυκίας οὐκέτι ὡς πάλαϊ ἐπεικῆς ἐς τοὺς Μακεδόνας. (Arrian, vii. 8.)

possessor to contend with Zeus himself.* But no feature of the Hellenic character is more remarkable, as Mr. Grote himself has frequently and most ably shown, than inability to bear unexpected good fortune. A far smaller elevation had turned the brains of Miltiades, Pausanias, and Alcibiades. Was it then wonderful that an elevation such as none of them had dreamed of should turn the brain of Alexander also? We may believe that the conduct which policy dictated was also personally agreeable; that he took a delight, unreasonable indeed to a philosopher, but natural to a man, in the splendours of his new position; that he may even have been beguiled into some of its concomitant vices, into something of the luxury and recklessness of an eastern monarch. The mind of Alexander was peculiarly susceptible to heroic and legendary associations; he was at once the descendant and the imitator of gods and heroes. His own exploits had surpassed those recorded of any of his divine ancestors or their compeers; Achilles, Hercules, Theseus, Dionysus, had done and suffered less than Alexander. Was it then wonderful that he should seriously believe that one who had surpassed their acts must at least equal their parentage? that it was not merely from pride or policy, but in genuine faith†, that he disclaimed a human progenitor in Philip, and looked for the real father of the conqueror and lord of earth in the conqueror and lord of the celestial world?

We believe, then, that policy, passion, and genuine superstition were all combined in the demand which Alexander made for divine, or at least for unusual, honours. He had assumed the position of the Great King, and he demanded the homage familiar to that position. Such homage his barbarian subjects were perfectly ready to pay, and they would probably have had but little respect for a king who failed to exact it. But what to a Persian appeared only the natural expression of respect for the royal dignity, appeared to Greeks and Macedonians an invasion of the honour due only to the immortal gods. Yet Alexander could hardly, with any prudence, draw a distinction between the two classes of his subjects. He certainly could not tolerate a state of things in which every Persian who came to do his ordinary service to his sovereign was exposed to the coarse ridicule of Macedonian soldiers and to the more eloquent invectives of Grecian sophists.‡ The claim of divine origin was not needed to impose upon orientals; it was needed

* ἐλόντες δὲ ταύτην αὐτὴν πόλιν, [Σούσα] θαρσύνοντες εὐθὺς τοῦ Διὸς πλοῦτον περὶ ἐρίζετε. (Herod. v. 49.)

† Mr. Grote admits this, vol. xii. p. 202. j *

‡ See Arrian, iv. 12. Compare Plut. Alex. 74.

to impose upon Europeans. The orientals were fully prepared to pay all that was asked to a mere earthly sovereign. Generation by a god was an idea quite repugnant to the Persian religion, while nothing was more familiar to Grecian notions. Least of all would Alexander, in order to impose upon his Persian subjects, have chosen as his parent a deity of the conquered and despised Egyptians. This was no difficulty to the Greeks and Macedonians, who identified the Egyptian Ammon with their own Zeus. The homage which they refused to an earthly king, they might willingly pay to the son of Zeus, the compeer of Hercules and Dionysus. Nor was Alexander the first to receive similar or greater honours even during his lifetime. Lysander, the Spartan citizen, had supplanted Hera in the devotion of the Samians*; and Philip, the Macedonian king, had, on a memorable occasion, marched as a thirteenth among the twelve great gods of Olympus.† When the idea of a divine origin first occurred to Alexander or his courtiers is far from clear. The inferior writers give us copious details of the reception which his divine parent gave him at his Libyan oracle; but the sober Arrian preserves a discreet silence.

Probably no other way could be found to reconcile his European subjects to a homage which was absolutely necessary to maintain his Asiatic dominion. But nothing shows more clearly the incongruous nature of his position as at once despotic King of Asia, constitutional‡ King of the Macedonians, and elective President of the Hellenic Confederacy. It is not wonderful if it led him in his later days to a treatment of his European subjects and confederates widely different from that of the early part of his reign. He not only sent round to all the cities of Greece to demand divine honours, which were perhaps not worth refusing §, but he ordered each city to restore its political

* Plut. Lys. 18.

† Diod. xvi. 92. 95.

‡ We think we may fairly use this word. Of course, as Mr. Grote often tells us, the will of the king, and not the declared will of the people, was the great moving cause in Macedonian affairs. But the Macedonians were not slaves. Alexander himself (Arrian, ii. 7.) contrasts the Macedonians as *ελεύθεροι*, with the Persians as *δούλοι*; Curtius (iv. 7. 31.) speaks of them as, 'Macedones *assæti* quidem regio imperio, sed majore libertatis umbrâ quam cæteræ gentes.' Certainly people who retained in their own hands the power of life and death, and before whom their sovereign appeared as an accuser — sometimes an unsuccessful accuser — cannot be confounded with the subjects of an eastern despotism.

§ See Thirlwall, vol. vii. p. 163.

exiles, an interference with their internal government certainly not warranted by his position as head of the Greek Confederacy. And, in other respects also, from this unfortunate period his worst failings were more strongly developed. Had not Alexander been, from the first, impetuous and self-confident, he could never have entered upon his career of victory. Impetuosity and self-exaltation now grew upon him, till he could endure neither restraint nor opposition. In one melancholy instance, we even find these dangerous tendencies combined with something like the suspicious temper of an eastern despot. It is possible that Cleitus might have fallen by his hand in a moment of excitement at any period of his life*; but we cannot conceive the fate of Philotas and Parmenion occurring at any moment before his entry into Persepolis. It is not safe to rely on the details given by Curtius and Plutarch of that unhappy story; and we are hardly in a condition to pronounce with confidence upon the guilt or innocence of the victims. We are not required to believe that Alexander invited Philotas to his table after he had resolved on his destruction, nor that he listened to and derided the cries of his former friend when in the agonies of the torture. But we can plainly see that he brought an accusation and procured a condemnation, on grounds which, to say the least, seem insufficient. For once the narrative of Arrian gives us the impression that there was something which he or his authorities wished to slur over; and one would like to know the grounds which led the judicious Strabo to his apparent conviction of the guilt of the accused.† We are told that the Macedonian law of treason sentenced the relations of the guilty party to the same punishment as himself. We are also told by Diodorus‡ that Parmenion was formally condemned by the military Assembly, the constitutional tribunal when the life of a Macedonian was at stake. We may add that the acquittal of some of the persons whom Alexander accused, shows that that Assembly exercised a discretion of its own, and did not always meet merely to register the royal decrees. It is therefore quite possible that the death of Parmenion, as well as that of Philotas, may have been in strict accordance with the letter of the law. But it is far more certain that Alexander would

* The scene between Philip and Alexander recorded by Plutarch, (Alex. p. 9.) certainly exhibits the germ of those failings which afterwards led to the murder of Cleitus.

† Φιλόταν ἀνέλε τὸν Παρμενίωνος νίον, φωράσας ἐπιβουλήν. xv. 2. (vol. iii. p. 312.)

‡ xvii. 80.

never have executed such a law upon his old friend and instructor, in the days when he handed Parmenion's own accusing letter to his physician, and drank off the potion in which death was said to lurk.

We have already quoted the remark of Mr. Grote that the character of Alexander recalled, to a great extent, that of the heroes of legendary Greece. By virtue of the same features, it forestalled, to a great extent, that of the heroes of mediæval chivalry. Bishop Thirlwall * truly observes that his disposition was 'rather generous than either merciful or scrupulously just,' but that 'cruelty, in the most odious sense of the word, wanton injustice, was always foreign to his nature.' Recklessness of human suffering is the necessary characteristic of every conqueror; but we have no reason to attribute it to Alexander in any greater degree than is shared by all other aggressive warriors. But in Alexander, a general of the highest order, and at the same time a man full of the highest spirit of personal adventure, we find, it may be, a greater delight in the practice of war for its own sake, than in the warriors of the Grecian commonwealths. In Alexander, too, a royal warrior, we find a feature of the chivalrous character which could not occur in his republican predecessors. We allude to his extreme courtesy and deference to persons of his own rank: his almost excessive generosity to the family of Darius, and to Darius himself when he was no more. This is still more impressively set before us in his famous dialogue with the captive Porus, an adversary indeed after his own heart. The death and misery of innocent thousands is easily forgotten in the excess of chivalrous respect between the imperial combatants who use them as their playthings. All these things grew upon Alexander during the latter portion of his career. It is impossible to look with the same complacency upon his Indian campaigns as upon his warfare in Bithynia and Syria. The mission of Hellenic vengeance was then over. Personal ambition and love of adventure had been strongly mingled with it from the first; then they became the ruling passions. Yet his position, even in his later expeditions, is one easy to understand, if not altogether to justify. He was the Great King, partly recovering provinces which had been dismembered from his predecessors, partly establishing their vague claims to the universal empire of Asia. But he was also the Hellenic warrior, asserting the natural right of the civilised man over the barbarian. He was the demigod, the son of Zeus, commissioned, like Theseus or Hercules, at once to conquer and

to civilise the earth. He was the ardent searcher after knowledge, eager to extend the limits of human science, and to explore distant lands which could only be explored at the point of the sword. In his later campaigns we can discern an increase of arrogance, of temerity, of recklessness of human suffering; but it does not appear that he ever violated the received laws of war of his own age*; and certainly, even in his most unprovoked aggressions, we may discern traces of a generosity of spirit, a nobleness of ultimate design, which at once distinguish him from the vulgar herd of conquerors and devastators.

The ultimate designs of Alexander must ever remain obscure; it is clearly impossible to tell what might have been effected by one of such mighty powers cut off at so early a stage of his career. That he contemplated still further conquests seems indisputable.† The only question is, were his conquests, actual and prospective, the mere result of ambition and love of adventure, or is he to be regarded as in any degree the intentional missionary of Hellenic culture? That such he was is set forth with much warmth and extravagance in a special treatise of Plutarch‡; it is argued more soberly, but with true vigour and eloquence, in the seventh volume of Bishop Thirlwall.§ Mr. Grote denies him all merit of the kind. But Mr. Grote too completely identifies 'Hellenism' with republicanism to be a perfectly fair judge. He will hardly allow the existence of Hellenic culture under a monarchy. Yet surely there is a difference between Greek and barbarian anterior and superior to the distinction of forms of government. Alexander is said to have found both aristocracies and democracies in India, but surely such aristocracies and democracies might need Hellenising by his Macedonian monarchy. That Alexander did carry Hellenic culture into a large portion of the world, is an undoubted fact.

* Plutarch (Alex. 59.) says of one occasion in the Indian war: σπεισάμενος ἔν τινι πόλει πρὸς αὐτοὺς ἀπίοντας ἐν ὄψι λαβὼν ἅπαντας ἀπέκτεινε· καὶ τοῦτο τοῖς πολεμικοῖς αὐτοῦ ἔργοις τάλλα νομίμως καὶ βασιλικῶς πολεμήσαντος ὥσπερ κηλὶς πρόσεστιν. The place alluded to must be Massaga. If so, the narration in Arrian (iv. 27.) does not bear out Plutarch's censure. The capitulation was clearly broken on the other side. We may accept Bishop Thirlwall's (vol. vii. p. 8.) censure, that 'Alexander exhibited less generosity than might have been expected from him, even if mercy was out of the question;' but there was no breach of faith.

† Arrian, vii. 1.; *ib.* 19.

‡ Περὶ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου τύχης ἡ ἀρετῆς.

§ P. 121. *et seq.*

That he intended to do so is but an inference; but surely it is a very natural one.

Mr. Grote, however, somewhat strangely, depreciates the merit of Alexander in this respect, in order comparatively to extol his successors.* So far as Asia was Hellenised at all, it was, he tells us, not Alexander, but the Ptolemies and Seleucidæ, who Hellenised it. Undoubtedly the details of the process were carried out by them; but they did nothing but follow the impulse which had been given them by their great master. Undoubtedly also, as Mr. Grote points out, their circumstances were in some respects more favourable than those of Alexander for carrying on the work. As much could not be done in eleven years of marching and countermarching as in two centuries of comparative peace. Again, Asia Minor, as the event proved, admitted of permanent Hellenisation, and Syria and Egypt of receiving permanent Hellenic colonies. But Hellenic culture could not permanently flourish on the banks of the Indus and the Jaxartes. Yet it surely speaks much for Alexander's zeal in the cause, when we find him labouring for it under such unfavourable circumstances. At every promising spot he founds a Greek city, an Alexandria, and plants in it a Greek or Macedonian colony, whose language and manners might be communicated to their barbarian fellow-citizens. Nor was his labour, even in these remote regions, entirely thrown away. A Greek kingdom of Bactria flourished for some ages; several of his cities, though no longer Greek, flourish to this day; one at least, Candahar, still retains the name of its founder. Mr. Grote himself does not deny that 'real consequences beneficial to humanity arose from Alexander's enlarged and systematic exploration of the earth, combined with increased means of communication among its inhabitants.'† Bishop Thirlwall, as might be expected, is far more copious and eloquent on this point: —

'Let any one contemplate the contrast between the state of Asia under Alexander, and the time when Egypt was either in revolt against Persia, or visited by her irritated conquerors with the punishment of repeated insurrection, when almost every part of the great mountain chain which traverses the length of Asia, from the Mediterranean to the borders of India, was inhabited by fierce, independent, predatory tribes: when the Persian kings themselves were forced to pay tribute before they were allowed to pass from one of their capitals to another. Let any one endeavour to enter

into the feelings, with which a Phœnician merchant must have viewed the change that took place in the face of the earth, when the Egyptian Alexandria had begun to receive and pour out an inexhaustible tide of wealth: when Babylon had become a great port: when a passage was opened both by sea and land between the Euphrates and the Indus: when the forests on the shores of the Caspian had begun to resound with the axe and the hammer. It will then appear that this part of the benefit which flowed from Alexander's conquest cannot be easily exaggerated.

'And yet this was perhaps the smallest part of his glory.'

Still more strangely, to our mind, does Mr. Grote specially depreciate the merit of the greatest of Alexander's foundations. On a spot whose advantages had, for we know not how many thousand years, been overlooked by the vaunted wisdom of Egypt, a glance and a word of the Macedonian called into being the greatest emporium of the commerce and cultivation of the world. But Mr. Grote tells us that the greatness of Alexandria was not owing to Alexander, but to the Ptolemies. As a single city of Alexander's universal empire, it could never have become what it became as the royal seat of the smaller monarchy. Possibly not: yet two points are worth noticing: first, that, if we may believe Niebuhr, Alexander designed Alexandria as the capital of his universal empire; and secondly, that the commercial importance of Alexandria was greater when it had become a provincial city of the Roman dominion than it had been under at least the later Ptolemies.† And surely, after all, it is no disparagement to an originally great conception, if circumstances eventually give it a still greater development than its first designer could have hoped for.

Nor does Alexander's partial adoption of Asiatic manners really prove anything against his civilising intentions. The barbarian could only be won to the higher calling which was set before him by a certain amount of condescension to his own prejudices. Greek sophists and Macedonian soldiers saw in the Persians merely born slaves with whom it was degrading to hold intercommunion. Alexander judged more favourably of his new subjects. If he himself wore the costume of a Persian king, he communicated to the chosen youth of Persia the tongue of Greece, the arms and discipline of Macedonia.§ This surely does not justify Mr. Grote's expression, that 'instead of Hellen-

* Vol. vii. p. 120.

† Vol. xii. p. 200.

‡ See Merivale's Rome, vol. iv. p. 125.

§ See Thirlwall, vol. vii. p. 89.

'ising Asia, he was tending to Asiatic Macedonia and Hellas.'" Mr. Grote is again deceived by his unwillingness to view the case from any but a political point of view. Alexander seems to him to be tending to 'Asiatic Macedonia and Hellas,' because he increased the royal power in Macedonia, and extended it over Hellas. And we cannot help remarking how, throughout his whole argument, Mr. Grote, who regards Alexander and his Macedonians as utterly non-Hellenic, is constantly driven to speak of Greece and Macedonia as forming a single aggregate in opposition to the barbarians of Asia.

On the general merits of Alexander in his purely military capacity there is the less necessity for us to enlarge, as no one has ever done more full justice to them than Mr. Grote himself. The carping spirit of Niebuhr seems half-inclined, if it were possible, to depreciate him in this respect also. The campaigns of Alexander are the earliest in which we can study war on a grand scale, carried out with all the appliances of art then existing. Above all, is he conspicuous for his skill in the harmonious employment of troops of different kinds. Horsemen, phalangists, hypaspists, archers, horse-archers, all find their appropriate place. But our object is less to extol Alexander as a soldier than to vindicate him as a conqueror, to claim for him a higher moral and intellectual rank than can belong to the mere soldier, however illustrious. We have always delighted to contemplate Alexander as one who, among all the temptations of the king and the warrior, still retained his love for elegant literature and scientific discovery. We were therefore surprised indeed at finding the last paragraph of Mr. Grote's ninety-fourth chapter thus analysed in the margin: 'Interest of Alexander in literature and science, *not great*.' Yet in the text he allows that he probably assisted Aristotle in his zoological researches, and adds that 'the intellectual turn of Alexander was towards literature, poetry, and history.' He proceeds to quote the instances given by Plutarch of his sending for historical and poetical works on his distant campaigns. To us this seems as much as could be done by a general on a distant march to preserve his personal taste for literature, poetry, and history, and to encourage others in the pursuit of physical science.

We have thus far endeavoured to defend the general character of Alexander against the view of him taken by Niebuhr, and, in a milder form, by Mr. Grote. We have implied that there are

numerous individual cases in which, out of various conflicting reports, Mr. Grote adopts those most unfavourable to Alexander on what appear to us to be inconclusive grounds. It is quite beyond our power to give a detailed examination of them all. We will therefore select three of the most remarkable, namely, the conduct of Alexander at Tyre, at Gaza, and at Persepolis.

The two first of these enterprises formed the consummation of his earlier victories, the third was the formal gathering in of his ultimate success. At Granicus, at Issus, and at Gaugamela he had overthrown the hosts of the Great King in open combat; at Tyre and at Gaza he overcame the most obstinate resistance of his feudatories and lieutenants; at Persepolis he entered into undisputed possession of his home and treasure. We must confess that we cannot enter into Mr. Grote's conception of the siege of Tyre.* He seems to regard it, irrespective of moral considerations, as a mere foolhardy enterprise, a simple waste of time which, from Alexander's own point of view, might have been better employed. Sympathy may be enlisted on the side of the Tyrians on many grounds. In the narrative of any siege, our feelings almost unavoidably side with the beleaguered party. Whatever may be the right or wrong of the original quarrel, the besiegers are, then and there, the aggressors, and the besieged the defenders, and they are most commonly too the weaker party. The Tyrians again, from their former history, their commercial greatness, their comparative political freedom, possess a claim upon us far beyond the ordinary subjects of Persia. They were fully justified in braving every extremity on behalf of their allegiance to the Persian monarch. They were something more than justified in doing so in behalf of their independence of Persian and Macedonian alike. Nor should we be very hard upon them for first of all submitting to the invader, and then repenting, drawing back, resisting him to the death. But we must consider the matter from Alexander's point of view also. The question of abstract justice must of course relate to the war as a whole, and not to each particular stage of its operations. If Alexander was to conquer Persia, he must conquer Tyre. Tyre offered her submission without waiting to be attacked; she recognised Alexander as her sovereign, and promised obedience to all his commands.† His first command was an intimation, conveyed in highly complimentary language, of his wish to enter the city, and offer sacrifice in the great temple of Hercules. The request was doubtless

* Vol. xii. p. 182.

† Arrian, ii. 15.

half religious, half political. Alexander would be sincerely anxious to visit and to honour so renowned a shrine of his own supposed ancestor. But he would be also glad to avail himself of so honourable a pretext for proving the fidelity of his new subjects. We really cannot see that this was, as Mr. Grote calls it, 'an extreme demand;' and, in any case, the Tyrians had promised to comply with all his demands, extreme or otherwise. When the demand was refused, it was utterly impossible to leave the refusal unpunished. It would at once have broken the prestige of success, and would have made his conquest of Western Asia imperfect. Had Tyre, with her powerful fleet, been left to defy his power unchastised, anti-Macedonian movements might have been constantly organised in Greece and Asia Minor. Nor could he leave Tyre, like the Halicarnassian citadel, to be blockaded by a mere division of his army. It required, as the event proved, his own presence and his whole force. This famous siege had undoubtedly the unhappy result of 'degrading and crushing one of the most ancient, spirited, 'wealthy, and intelligent communities of the ancient world;' but that community most undoubtedly brought its destruction upon itself, and we certainly cannot admit that its conquest was 'politically unprofitable' to the conqueror.

Now how did Alexander treat his conquest? Tyre, after a noble resistance, was taken by storm. The Macedonians, according to Arrian*, were excited to extreme wrath because the Tyrians had habitually killed their Macedonian prisoners before the eyes of their comrades, and had thrown their bodies into the sea. The mere slaughter of the prisoners did not contradict Greek laws of war, though it would doubtless be felt as a special call to vengeance. But the mockery and the denial of burial were direct sins against Greek religious notions. We cannot therefore be surprised if the successful assault of the city was accompanied by a merciless slaughter. Such would probably have been the case with the most civilised armies of modern times. But did Alexander add to these horrors in cold blood? Arrian tells us that he spared all who took refuge in the temple of Hercules—who happened to be the king and the principal magistrates—and that he sold the rest as slaves, the common doom of prisoners in ancient warfare. According to Diodorus and Curtius, a certain portion of the captives were hanged or crucified by Alexander's order.† Mr. Grote accepts

* ii. 24.

† ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς τέκνα μὲν καὶ γυναῖκας ἐξηνδραποδίστατο, τοὺς δὲ

this tale. We see no sufficient ground for this statement. It is, to our mind, an instance of the mere love of horrors, which, as in other cases, shows itself in the invention of additional crimes on both sides. Curtius, who describes Alexander as crucifying Tyrian prisoners, also describes the Tyrians as murdering Macedonian heralds.* Arrian mentions neither atrocity; and we believe neither. Mr. Grote accepts the charge against Alexander, and rejects that against his enemies.

Similar, as appears to us, is the state of the case with regard to the atrocity attributed to Alexander after the conclusion of the second great siege, that of Gaza. Mr. Grote here revives a tale which, as far as we are aware, has found acceptance with no other modern writer, and which Bishop Thirlwall passes by with silent contempt. Mr. Grote would have us believe that Alexander, after the capture of Gaza, caused its brave defender, the eunuch Batis, to be dragged to death at his chariot-wheels, in imitation of the treatment of Hector's dead body by Achilles. This tale comes from Curtius, and from Hegesias, as quoted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus in one of his critical treatises.† Arrian, Plutarch, and Diodorus are alike ignorant of the story. The passage from Hegesias is quoted by Dionysius, without any historical object, as an instance of bad rhythm and bad taste. Mr. Grote truly says that 'the bad taste of Hegesias as a writer does not diminish his credibility as a witness.' But his credibility as a witness is seriously diminished by the concurrent testimony of antiquity against him in more important respects.‡ The tale seems to us utterly incredible. Mr. Grote allows that it 'stands out in respect of barbarity from all that we read respecting the treatment of conquered towns in anti-quity.' Curtius acknowledges that it is repugnant to the usual character of Alexander. § We might add that Alexander, if

νέους ἀπαντας, ὄντας οὐκ ἐλάττους τῶν διαχιλίων, ἐκρέμασε. (Diod. xvii. 46.)

'Triste deinde spectaculum victoribus ira præbuit Regis. Duo millia, in quibus occidendi defecerat rabies, crucibus affixi per ingens littoris spatium pependerunt.' (Curt. iv. 4.)

Mr. Grote, here and elsewhere, translates ἐκρέμασε, *hanged*, Bishop Thirlwall, *crucified*. It need not imply the latter, and, between Diodorus and Curtius, a tale of hanging might easily grow into a tale of crucifixion. Similarly Plutarch has, in one place, (Alex. 72.) ἀνεσταύρωσε, where Arrian (vii. 14.) has ἐκρέμασε.

* iv. 2.

† Vol. v. p. 125. ed. Reiske.

‡ See Smith's Dict. of Biog. art. Hegesias.

§ 'Aliàs virtutis etiam in hoste mirator.'

he wished to imitate Achilles, could hardly have forgotten that Hector was dead, while Batis was living, and moreover he would hardly have imitated Achilles in an action which Homer expressly condemns.* But Mr. Grote should surely not have omitted the fact that those who attribute this cruelty to Alexander, describe it as an act of revenge for a treacherous attempt upon Alexander on the part of Batis.† Both Hegesias and Curtius tell us that an Arab of the garrison, in the guise of a suppliant or deserter, obtained admission to Alexander, attempted to kill him, and was himself killed by the King. The tale reminds one of the stories, true or false, of the fate of the Seljuk Sultan Togrel Beg and of the Ottoman Amurath the First. Mr. Grote omits all mention of it, the only instance in which we have found him fail to put forth the whole evidence against his own view. To us the whole story, in both its parts, seems to be merely another instance of the love of marvels and horrors triumphing over simple truth. Imaginary crimes are heaped, certainly with praiseworthy impartiality, alike upon Alexander and upon his antagonists.

And now as to Persepolis. We have already implied that we agree with Mr. Grote in believing the destruction of the Persepolitan palace to have been Alexander's deliberate act. We have no doubt but that the tale of Thais at the banquet is a mere romantic invention. Arrian, indeed ‡, blames the act of destruction, because it could be no punishment to the real offenders, the Persians of a century and a half earlier. This is rather an objection to the whole war than to this particular action. No doubt to Alexander it seemed a high symbolical rite, expressive of Grecian victory and barbarian overthrow. The deed was done in opposition to the objection of Parmenion that it did not become Alexander to destroy his own property, and that such a course would lead the Asiatics to regard him as a mere passing devastator, and not as a permanent sovereign. To Alexander such arguments would doubtless sound like the suggestions of base avarice to stay the hand of vengeance. Nor do we see, with Bishop Thirlwall §, that this view is at

* ἡ ῥα, καὶ Ἐκτορα δῖον ἀεὶ κεία μήδετο ἔργα. (Il. xxii. 395.)

† Hegesias clearly implies this. The words *μισήσας ἐφ' οἷς ἐβέβου-
λεντο* must refer, not to the general resistance, but to the special attempt against Alexander's life.

‡ iii. 18.

§ Vol. vi. p. 287. He argues again that this deliberate destruction is inconsistent with the reverence shown by Alexander to the tomb of Cyrus. But Cyrus was guiltless of Marathon and Salamis, while

all inconsistent with the fact that he repented of the deed in after times. The destruction was the act of the Captain-general of Greece; the repentance was the sentiment of the King of Asia. When the deed was done, he did not yet feel that the home of the barbarian was his own. With altered circumstances and altered feelings, he might well regret the devastation of the choicest ornament of his empire.

Mr. Grote*, indeed, would add to this symbolical and imposing manifestation of vengeance an act of quite another character, namely, a general massacre of the male inhabitants of Persepolis sanctioned and encouraged by Alexander. He represents, in short, a city which seems to have made no resistance as undergoing the worst fate of one taken by storm. This version he derives from Curtius† and Diodorus‡, whose accounts, we think, he somewhat amplifies. For neither author directly states that Alexander ordered the massacre, while Curtius does mention his ultimately arresting it. Arrian says nothing of the kind, nor yet, in our judgment, does Plutarch. Mr. Grote refers, indeed, to a letter of Alexander's quoted by the last-mentioned author§, in which the king mentions a slaughter as having taken place by his order 'on grounds of state policy.'|| But this allusion occurs in a most confused and incoherent paragraph of Plutarch, in which he jumbles together the passage of the Persian Gates and the appropriation of the Persepolitan treasure. Of neither event does he give any geographical description more exact than is implied in the words Πέρσις and Πέρσαι. It may well be that the slaughter referred to by Plutarch means the slaughter at the Persian Gates. There Alexander met with a most desperate resistance. To direct his soldiers to refuse quarter, horrible as it seems to us, would be in nowise repugnant to Greek laws of war. A slaughter there might very probably 'be profitable to him' (αὐτῷ λυσιτελεῖν) as tending to strike terror into others who might contemplate resistance. But no such motive of policy could apply to the massacre of an unarmed population. Such a deed would be fully open to the objection urged by Par-

the buildings at Persepolis were actually the works of Darius and Xerxes. See Fergusson's 'Nineveh and Persepolis.'

* Vol. xii. p. 239.

† v. 6. 3-7.

‡ xvii. 70, 71.

§ Alex. 37. We have already mentioned the suspicion attaching to these supposed letters of Alexander.

|| νικίζων αὐτῷ τοῦτο λυσιτελεῖν ἐκέλευεν ἀποσφάττεσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώ-

mention; it would not strike terror, but horror; its submission earned no better fate than resistance, all men would choose the bolder alternative. A massacre at Persepolis could only have been allowed, as Mr. Grote seems to imply, under the influence of some perverted and horrible form of the feeling which prompted the destruction of the palace. But this feeling was something quite different from state policy, and was even, as Parmenion very soundly urged, quite repugnant to it. In fact Mr. Grote, on this occasion, treats his authorities rather loosely. Diodorus and Curtius speak of the massacre; they also represent the destruction of the palace as a drunken freak suggested by Thais. Arrian says nothing of the massacre, and represents the destruction of the palace as deliberate. Mr. Grote takes something from each narrative to work up, together with some touches of his own, into a picture of savage and cold-blooded ferocity on the part of Alexander, which is not to be found in either. We follow Arrian; but the other story may well be, as is so often the case, the exaggeration or distortion of something which really took place. The destruction of the palace may have been accompanied by a licence to plunder; still more probably, would it become an occasion for unlicensed plunder. In such a scene of confusion, some lives might easily be lost; and this would be quite sufficient groundwork for rhetorical historians to work up into the moving picture which we find in Curtius and Diodorus.*

Perhaps, as we have already hinted, Alexander would have better consulted his own truest glory and the ultimate benefit

* We have already alluded to another horrible tale, which Mr. Grote accepts (vol. xi. p. 275.), but on which Bishop Thirlwall is silent, namely, the massacre of the Branchidæ in Sogdiana. Like many other similar tales, we have not space to dissect it in detail, but must content ourselves with the selection made in the text. Yet we cannot forbear remarking thus much:

First, that the second of the passages from Strabo, quoted by Mr. Grote, does not imply a massacre. Strabo merely says, τὸ τῶν Βραγχιδῶν ἄστυ ἀνελεῖν.

Secondly, that in the third passage the grounds of Alexander's supposed special devotion to the oracle of Branchidæ are introduced by Strabo with great contempt: προστραγῶδει δὲ τοῖσις ὁ Καλλισθένης, κ.τ.λ.

Thirdly, that the whole story of the Sogdian Branchidæ and their origin is very difficult to reconcile with the narrative of Herodotus. The tale in Strabo and Suidas reads very like a perversion of that in Herod. vi. 20.

of mankind, had he confined himself to Tyre and Gaza, and had he never entered Persepolis at all. His strictly Hellenic mission called him to the subjugation of those regions only which his successors, Macedonian, Roman, and Byzantine, proved eventually able to retain. But it was not in human nature to pause in such a career. Had he turned back when Parmenion counselled him, he must needs have been, as oriental writers paint him, not merely Iskender the Conqueror, but Iskender the Prophet. And a prophet perchance, in an indirect and unintentional way, he really was. As the pioneer of Hellenic cultivation, he became eventually the pioneer of Christianity. He paved the way for the intellectual empire of the Greek and for the political empire of the Roman.* And it was with that empire, intellectual and political, that the religion of Christ became permanently coextensive. As the champion of the West against the East, Alexander prefigured the later championship of the Cross against the Crescent. He pointed dimly to a day when the tongue which he spoke, and the system which he founded, should become the badge and bulwark of a creed which to him would have seemed the most alien to all his schemes and pretensions. That creed first arose in a land where his name was cherished; it received its formal designation in the greatest city of his successors; it allied itself with the intellectual life of that yet more famous city which still hands down to us his name. Jerusalem†, Antioch, Alexandria, all revered the Macedonian conqueror, as in some sort their founder or benefactor. The son of Ammon, the worshipper of Belus, prepared the way for a faith which should overthrow the idols of Egypt and Assyria. The heroes of a later age, who bore up against the Fire-worshipper and the

* Nowhere has fuller justice been done to the effects of Alexander's conquests than in the opening chapter of Mr. Finlay's 'Greece under the Romans.' Of the two great historians, of Greece independent and Greece enslaved, the latter is here the better judge. To Mr. Grote, Alexander is the end of his subject, to Mr. Finlay he is the beginning. The historian of the Athenian Democracy curses the Macedonian as a destroyer; to the historian of the Byzantine Empire he appears entitled to the honours of a founder.

† It is not necessary for our purpose to go into the famous details of Alexander's supposed visit to Jerusalem. But, if the tale, as it stands, be a fable, it at least points to favours conferred by Alexander upon the Jews and to gratitude entertained by the Jews towards Alexander. Cyrus and Alexander, the Persian and the Macedonian founder, occupy a place in Jewish history most unlike that of most heathen rulers.

Moslem, did but tread in his steps and follow out the career which he had opened. If he overthrew the liberties of Hellas, in their native seat, he gave to the Hellenic mind a wider scope, and eventually a yet nobler mission. He was the precursor of Heraclius restoring the True Cross from its Persian bondage, of Leo beating back the triumphant Saracen from the walls of the city which Philip himself had besieged in vain. The victories of Christian Emperors, the teaching of Christian Fathers, the abiding life of the tongue and arts of Greece far beyond the limits of old Hellas, perhaps the retention of Greek nationality down to our own times, all sprang from the triumphs of this perhaps 'non-Hellenic conqueror,' but, in his ultimate results, most truly Hellenic missionary. And though we may not personally attribute to him the praise of results which neither he nor any mortal could have contemplated, let us at least do justice to the great and noble qualities, the extended and enlightened aims, which marked his brief career on earth. Many faults, and a few crimes, indeed stain his glory; but perhaps none of mortal race ever went through such an ordeal. It would indeed have been a moral miracle if a fiery and impulsive youth had passed quite unscathed through such temptations as had never beset humanity before. A youth, a Greek, a warrior, a king, he would have been more than man, had he looked down quite undazzled from the giddy eminence of what he might well deem superhuman greatness. The fame of even the noblest of conquerors must yield to that of the peaceful benefactors of their species, or of the warriors whose victories do but secure the liberties of nations. We do not place Alexander beside Leonidas or Washington, beside Alfred or William the Silent. But we do protest against a view which places him in the same class with Attila and Jenghiz and Timour. Their warfare was devastation for its own sake; his was conquest which went hand in hand with discovery and improvement. Theirs was a wild beast's thirst of blood, a barbarian's lust of mere dominion; his was 'an ambition which almost grew into one with the highest of which man is capable, the desire of knowledge and the love of good.*' Such is the judgment of one who yields to none in the extent of his research, and who, if he may yield to some of his competitors in the brilliancy of original discovery, yet surpasses them in those calm and judicial faculties, without which research and brilliancy are vain. By the judgment of that great historian we still abide.

* Thirlwall, vol. vii. p. 119.

ART. II. — 1. *Tableau de la Population de l'Empire Français par Départements.* Année 1856.

2. *Les Consommations de Paris.* Par ARMAND HUSSON. Paris: 1856.

WHATEVER be the interest attached to the political institutions of the French Empire, their present condition baffles curiosity, and their future fate defies speculation. It is not our intention in these pages either to criticise the internal acts of a Government which shuns publicity, or to express any confidence in the permanence of a system which combines the inherent weakness of despotic government with a formidable array of actual power. But if it be difficult to trace the probable course of the destinies of that great nation by the ordinary landmarks of political science, we are driven to have recourse to those general principles which seldom fail, in the long run, to find their correct application. Public opinion may be mute, the voice of opposition may be hushed, the action of the Executive power absolute and unrestrained in all its branches; but there are other indications of the state of the country which cannot be stifled or concealed—the movement of the population, the state of credit, the rate of wages, the supply and price of food for the people, are social facts from which the soundest political inferences may be drawn; and it is from these facts alone that we venture to form or to suggest any positive opinions on the future prospects of France.

Of these facts by far the most remarkable, the most certain, and the least expected are those which have recently been disclosed by the publication of the quinquennial census of the French Empire. The 'Moniteur' published the official returns which we have placed at the head of this article on the last day of 1856; but, as the public discussion of so unwelcome a subject by the press was prohibited, it is only within the walls of the French Institute, that the important questions connected with these returns have been duly appreciated. The results of this inquiry may be stated in a few lines. It appears from the census of 1856 as compared with the census of 1851, that the increase of the whole population of France in a period of five years has not exceeded 256,000 souls. The decline in the ordinary rate of increase has been progressive. From 1841 to 1846 the augmentation amounted to 1,200,000; from 1846 to 1851 the augmentation had fallen off to 380,000; from 1851 to 1856 it has dwindled to 256,000. Hence, it may be said that

the population of France, taken collectively, has been almost stationary for the last ten years.

But to this remarkable fact another consideration of equal gravity must be added. The population, though stationary in numbers, has not remained stationary in its abodes. On the contrary, a vast internal migration has been going on during this period from the rural districts to the towns. Thus, the department of the Seine, in which Paris is situated, has gained no less than 300,000 souls in the space of five years, having risen from 1,422,065 souls in 1851, to 1,727,419 in 1856; or, in other words, the metropolis has gained in this short period 50,000 inhabitants more than the total increase of population in the rest of France. The same phenomenon may be observed in several of the most populous departments, which are the seats of trade or manufactures. Thus, in each of the seven following departments a marked increase is perceptible.

	1851.	1856.	Increase.
Bouches du Rhône (Marseilles) - - -	428,989	473,365	44,376
Gard (Nîmes) - - -	408,163	419,697	11,534
Gironde (Bordeaux) - -	614,387	640,757	26,370
Loire (St. Etienne) - -	472,588	505,260	32,672
Rhône (Lyons) - - -	574,745	625,991	51,246
Nord (Lille) - - -	1,158,285	1,212,353	54,068
Loire Inférieure (Nantes) -	535,664	555,996	22,332

But, as this considerable augmentation has taken place in all the large towns of France, whilst the general population of the Empire has remained comparatively stationary, it is evident that the increased population of the towns is drawn thither from the rural districts, and that the increase of the former must have produced a corresponding decrease in the latter. Such is in truth the fact. In no less than 54 departments, or in about two-thirds of the territory of France, the census of 1856 demonstrates that a notable diminution has taken place since the census of 1851. Thus, in the following departments, which we take almost at hazard, we find these returns,

	1851.	1856.	Decrease.
Isère - - - -	603,497	576,637	27,860
Meuse - - - -	328,657	305,727	22,930
Meurthe - - -	450,423	424,873	26,050
Bas Rhin - - -	587,434	563,855	23,579
Ariège - - - -	267,435	251,318	16,117
Jura - - - -	313,361	296,701	16,660
Vosges - - - -	427,409	405,708	21,701
Côte d'Or - - -	400,297	385,131	15,166
Haute-Saône - -	347,469	312,397	35,072

Some of these departments are important agricultural districts, but in the poorer and less populous regions the loss of men is even more severely felt, and in some parts the labours of husbandry are seriously impeded for want of hands, and by the consequent rise in agricultural wages. The same movement is going on from the villages and hamlets to the towns within the same department, though this change does not appear on the returns now before us. As a general fact, it may be stated from these returns, that the masses of the town population of France have in the last three years rapidly increased, whilst the more scattered rural population has no less signally diminished; and it may readily be conceived that this fact excites the utmost solicitude throughout the country, for it affects in no slight degree the best interests of the nation.

A local increase of population due to artificial causes, which we shall presently proceed to consider, and not to the common rate of natural increase, obviously tends to displace the adult male population to a far greater extent than any other class. It is not either women, or children, or old persons, but the working peasantry in the best years of life, who are thus drawn away to seek manual employment in the towns, in preference to the more contracted sphere of activity in which they were born. Hence the actual loss of adult male labour to the rural districts is far greater than the proportionate diminution of the whole population indicated by these figures.

This sudden, unprecedented, and we may almost say, violent result, can be traced to no natural cause at all. The French rural population is, or was, habitually stationary, and so little inclined to emigration or adventure, that nothing less than a very powerful stimulus could have overcome their well-known disposition. That stimulus has been applied by the present Government during the last five years in a thousand ways, some of them laudable, some of them foolish and extravagant; but whether the movement and the prosperity thus imparted to the community be real or fictitious, its effect on the distribution of the population is of equal importance.

There can be no doubt that the main cause of this displacement of the population is to be found in the enormous sums spent by the State, and by the municipal bodies of the towns under the direction of the State, on public works, and on works, such as railroads, encouraged by the State, and in part executed at the public cost. In the metropolis, especially, where it appears that the increase in five years amounts to 300,000 souls, a very large portion of this additional population must be employed directly on the vast buildings projected and

executed by the Government, or indirectly in providing for the wants of the numerous classes which are maintained by the State. To this it may be added that as the Government thought fit during a period of actual scarcity to compel the city of Paris to supply bread below its real value, the strongest possible motive was given to the poorer classes to take refuge in a city where food was artificially reduced in price, and consequently to increase the consumption of that article in which a deficiency was felt elsewhere.

Had the rural emigration to which we have adverted been the result of natural causes, operating to raise the price of labour by the increased production of wealth, it would have been a national benefit, even though the agricultural interests of the country might have been temporarily depressed by it.* But we apprehend that the very reverse has been the case in France. This extraordinary agglomeration of the labouring classes in towns is the result, not of increased energy in the production of wealth, but of increased profusion in spending it. A considerable proportion of the works carried on at the public expense must be regarded, in spite of their magnificence, as unproductive; and although it is undoubtedly true that within the last three or four years enormous profits have been made, and large fortunes rapidly accumulated, yet these profits are for the most part the result of speculation; they do not denote any real augmentation of the national wealth, and they are spent almost as rapidly as they are made.

It is roughly, but we believe fairly computed, that within this period upwards of a milliard of francs, or forty millions sterling, has been made on the Bourse of Paris by the holders of the various stocks marketable there; or, in other words, that the present marketable value of these stocks is or has been augmented by that enormous amount during the present reign. This sum has been thrown for the most part into the hands of private persons, who, when they have been wise enough to realise the results of their good fortune, have found themselves positively enriched to very large amounts. Their habits, their

* We observe that our respectable contemporary, the 'Economist,' in commenting on these facts (1st February, 1857) affects to be astonished at the assertion that the accumulation of the rural population in towns can be regarded as a diminution in the production of national wealth and a symptom of declining national prosperity. But there is no similarity between the causes which led to an analogous movement of the rural population in England and the causes which are producing that movement in France, as will be seen by the following considerations in the text.

expenditure, their tastes, have expanded in the same proportion; and as the first use made of this easily acquired wealth is to spend it with profusion, the stream poured through the coffers of the rich has given an amazing impulse to every branch of industry; and by increasing the demand for labour, it may serve, of itself, to account for a large increase of the metropolitan population of Paris. But as no real increase has taken place in the productive value of these investments of capital, the money thus acquired and spent is in fact a portion of the national capital and not of the national savings.

What then, we may be asked, is the cause and the nature of this sudden and enormous rise in the value of property which is by its nature of the most fluctuating and uncertain description? No doubt the restoration of order by the authority of a Government which was able and willing to rescue property from the theories of the socialists and the violence of mobs, had a considerable and a legitimate effect in raising the value of things which had been depressed during the short and evil days of the second Republic, and in restoring to France much of that prosperity which she enjoyed under the reign of Louis-Philippe, until the very eve of the 24th February, 1848. But the Government did not rest here. It applied itself to the encouragement of colossal schemes for the increase, whether real or apparent, of value in all the marketable stocks on the Bourse. Thus, for example, the French railroads immediately became the objects of the most extraordinary favours. The railroad companies held them under certain leases conceded to them by the State for certain limited periods: the shorter the period was, the worse the bargain for the company and the better eventually for the public. By a series of transactions and arrangements, which were commenced in 1852, between the principal companies and the Government, these concessions were extended in some instances from thirty to ninety-nine years*, so that, by a draft on posterity, the actual holders of shares found themselves possessed of a property far more valuable than that they had originally agreed to take; and it is scarcely necessary to add that the persons by whose influence these arrangements were made were not slow to profit by them in their private

* The original concessions of the lines of railroad by the State to the working companies under Louis-Philippe's reign were for short periods: that of the Chemin du Nord for 36 years; that of Avignon and Marseilles, 33 years; that of Paris and Strasburg, 44 years; that of the Centre, 40 years; that of Tours to Nantes, 34; that of Orleans to Bordeaux, 28 years. All these terms have been enormously extended.

capacity. So also facilities were given for the amalgamation of important lines, which had the effect of securing the companies from competition, and giving them a virtual monopoly. Again, the companies have been authorised by the Government to issue debentures at a fixed rate of interest, by which means a larger share of the profits has become divisible among the shareholders, and in some instances a portion of the cost of maintenance of the railway has been thrown on this floating debt, to increase the dividends. These expedients are not altogether new to us, or unknown in this country. They very nearly resemble the artifices by which the 'Railway King' continued for a time to force up the value of railway property, to induce large numbers of credulous persons to imagine that they owed a fortune to Mr. Hudson's ability, and thus for a time to give an artificial stimulus by the apparent production of wealth. We fear that many of the operations which have been set on foot by some of the agents of the French Government are not more sound than Mr. Hudson's schemes; but they have become incalculably greater in extent, and have sensibly affected the property and population of the whole empire.

Loans have been tendered to public subscription, on terms which seemed to offer a certain and easy profit to the fortunate subscribers, and of course the lists were filled with avidity. Institutions like the *Credit Mobilier* were contrived to facilitate every sort of speculation: the rate of discount was kept down by the intervention of the State; even the Bank of France was induced to buy gold in this country above its value, and to sell it in Paris below its value, and this continuously for many months, at a loss of upwards of a quarter of a million; for no sacrifice is thought too great to keep up an appearance of unbounded prosperity.

This state of things has been judiciously described by M. Husson in the work before us, as one of the causes which have tended to derange the relations existing in France between the population and the supply of food. He says:—

'This confusion, which is kept up by the schemes of some men, and by the ignorance of others, drives to the Bourse multitudes of waiters upon fortune. The purchase of investments on State securities, whether from realised property or from savings, is no longer, as it once was, the chief object of the transactions carried on in that temple of money. Time-bargains have superseded *bonâ fide* purchases, and since railroads and limited liability have set afloat innumerable enterprises, speculation has assumed incalculable proportions. Nor is this state of stock-jobbing confined to adventurers or gamblers; it has infected men engaged in liberal professions, and many an example might be quoted from men who ought to know

better, but who have plunged into this tempestuous sea of rash calculations. Success does not always follow this pursuit of premiums and advances; but when good fortune attends such operations, it is not unnatural to spend with profusion what has been so easily gained, and the greater portion of these windfalls is commonly lavished on personal indulgences. The love of money, the natural inclination for material luxuries, and the impulses of vanity soon develop these seeds of extravagance and display. Who can wonder then at the complaints of high rents and expensive establishments which are now so common even in the more opulent classes? It is all attributed to circumstances, and the necessity of keeping up a social position, though the real cause is the love of indulgence; and amidst all this vulgar splendour many a man looks back with regret to the comparative simplicity and cheapness of former times.'

No doubt these signs of increasing wealth are not altogether fictitious. A people as active, industrious, and ingenious as the French, blessed with great natural advantages, and stimulated by the rapid progress of civilisation, cannot fail to augment its resources. The system of railroads converging to one point, and affording to the whole country a cheap and rapid mode of access to the capital, materially tends to increase the powerful attraction which Paris has ever exercised over the territory of France. But the fact that the natural augmentation of the population has been almost entirely arrested in the last ten years, and that the growth of the great cities must be altogether subtracted from the rural community, is calculated to raise doubts of the reality of that wealth which glitters with so much lustre in the streets of Paris or the provincial capitals; and, as we shall presently see, this check can hardly fail to tell unfavourably on the permanent welfare and power of the community.

It is, however, certain that, with the exception of some departments which are suffering from exceptional causes of distress — such as inundations or failure of crops, — the general aspect and condition of the French rural population shows a marked improvement in the last twenty years. Every new house is better built and better arranged than the old cottages. The blue linen blouse is not the only garment of the peasant winter and summer, but it is worn over good woollen clothing; the bread of the common people is whiter and purer, and the consumption of meat increases. Five and twenty years ago, in a small market-town of Normandy which we have sometimes visited, there lived but one butcher, who earned a precarious subsistence from the neighbouring gentry; in the same town there are now nine persons living by the sale of meat. The same progress is even more striking in Touraine, Picardy, and

the environs of Paris. But this progress in the well-being of the community has not led to any corresponding increase in the population. On the contrary, whether the doctrines of Mr. Malthus are followed or not in that country, some such check as he contemplated seems powerfully to operate against the rapidity of increase; and the more the advantages and luxuries of increasing wealth are felt and enjoyed, the less disposed are the French to meet the demands of numerous families.

The rate of increase of the population of France is known to have been extremely slow ever since an accurate account has been taken of it. It is, indeed, curious that Godwin was led to suppose, in his 'Essay on Population,' that the human species is more prolific in France than in any other country; and Buffon stated, that in Paris each marriage produced in his time four children upon an average, and that in the rural parts five at least, and often six, was a very common proportion. These facts were either entirely inaccurate, or are now at least singularly changed. It is certain that in the thirty-seven years which elapsed from 1817 to 1852, the mean annual increase of the population of France was only 155,929; but from 1846 to 1851 this increase had fallen to 76,000 per annum; and from 1851 to 1856 to 51,200. The progress of the population in France has at all times been a problem not easily explained; for although, as Mr. Malthus observed more than half a century ago, the number of small farmers and proprietors in that country had always a most powerful tendency to encourage population, yet the actual increase is remarkably slow. Mr. Laing, who is an energetic partisan of the subdivision of land, takes a precisely opposite view of its effects. He maintains that a division of property by a law of succession different in principle to the feudal, is the true check upon over-population; and that in raising the civilisation, habits, mode of living, and prudence of the lower classes of the community by a wider diffusion of property among them, we inoculate the whole mass of society with the restraints that property carries with it.* But if prudential considerations are the real cause of the check to population in France, they are rendered more acute and powerful at the present time not by any positive diminution of property, but by a relative increase in the wants of society.

Before the beginning of the revolutionary war, the whole population of the country was estimated by the National Assembly at twenty-six millions; so that in more than sixty years the total increase has been under fifty per cent. † In 1806 it may be

* Laing's Notes of a Traveller, chap. x.

taken at twenty-nine millions; in 1820, at thirty millions;—this slender increase of one million in fourteen years being accounted for by the frightful consumption of human life in the last ten years of the war. The progress in the next twenty years was more rapid, for it had risen in 1841 to thirty-four millions and a quarter; but from that time to the present the augmentation has been almost insensible. Yet during a portion of this period France has continued to make considerable progress in every branch of industry; her agriculture is improved; and she has not been engaged in any of those wars which consumed, from 1740 to 1815, so large a share of her male population. The check disclosed by the last census is still more unlooked for, and it can only be explained by causes distinct from those which are commonly supposed by the economists to govern the multiplication of the human species.

In addition to these general considerations, the remarkable fact is pointed out by M. Husson, that the proportion of births to the number of marriages, and likewise to the population, tends to decrease in Paris. Thus, from 1817 to 1831, there was in Paris one birth to 26·87 inhabitants; but from 1846 to 1851 only one birth to 31·98 inhabitants. He adds:—

‘It appears from these returns that whilst the number of marriages increases, that of births seems to decline, which attests a decrease in the fecundity of legitimate unions, and discloses an evident anxiety on the part of fathers of families as to the means of subsistence and of providing for their offspring. The cause must doubtless be traced to the laws which regulate the division of inheritances, whose certain effect is to divide property more and more.’ (*Husson*, p. 18.)

It is, therefore, altogether to immigration from other parts of France, and not to natural increase, that the recent increase of population in the Department of the Seine must be attributed. Including all births, whether legitimate or illegitimate (the latter being to the former in the proportion of rather more than one-third), the population of the capital is stationary, as far as it is affected by natural causes. Nay, in the period which elapsed from 1846 to 1851, owing to the storms of the Revolution and the ravages of the cholera, there was a decrease in the native population of Paris of 2,724 by the excess of deaths over births, and of 5,328 by emigration.* The change indicated by the last

* It is a curious exemplification of the effects of revolutions on society, that the deaths which occurred in France during the turbulent year 1849 were 962,008, or about 150,000 more than they had been in any year since the great cholera year of 1832. In 1849 the births in all France only exceeded the deaths by 13,458, being less than one-tenth of the difference between births and deaths in ordinary years.

census is, therefore, as sudden as it is enormous; and so little was it foreseen that M. Husson, writing last year before the completion of the census, says: 'It is probable the census of 1856 will *not* show a fresh augmentation.'

Having thus far considered these remarkable facts as they are presented to us in the official returns, and some of the causes to which they may be attributed, let us now observe their social consequences. The movement which is thus going on has the twofold effect of diminishing all that tends to the production of agricultural wealth, or, in other words, of food, in the country; and at the same time (if results so contradictory can be said to exist together), of increasing the powers of consumption in the towns and of stimulating the demand. On the one hand, there is a diminution of agricultural labour by the large draughts of men, in the most active years of life, who are attracted to the towns by high wages; on the other hand, there is a diminution of the capital employed in agriculture at the very time when it is most required to develop the resources of the country, or to supply by machinery the scarcity of hands, because powerful temptations have been held out to the peasantry to engage in speculations, to lend their capital to the State, and to divert their savings from the most natural and secure mode of investment. So strongly has capital been diverted from investments in land, that although personal property of certain kinds has risen enormously in value during the present reign, land has not yet recovered the value it had in France before the Revolution of 1848; and this in spite of the well-known passion of the French peasantry to acquire it. Again, this diversion of capital to speculative objects has contributed to diminish the facilities of obtaining money on mortgage, or of borrowing capital for agricultural improvements, except at a very high rate of interest. Nor will this appear astonishing when it is remembered that France has had to raise in the last three years, by extraordinary loans and advances, about eighty millions sterling for war expenses, and about sixty-six millions sterling for the execution of railways now in progress. The truth is, that the vast apparent wealth of France under Louis Napoleon means that she has spent her money with extraordinary profusion—not that she has augmented her savings, or improved her capital.

Hence, by an inevitable result, there is a diminution in the supply of agricultural produce and a rise in the price of provisions which is astonishing in its amount, though not astonishing when its true causes are brought to light. Those causes, we

agree with M. Husson, do not lie, as is commonly supposed in France, in the influx of Californian or Australian gold. Had the supplies of the country kept pace with the demand—as they might easily have done with a more efficient cultivation of the soil, or by opening the ports to foreign trade—prices might not have risen; but just as men found they had more money, or the semblance of money, to spend on their physical wants, the means of supplying those wants diminished in the home market, and owing to the prohibitive system which still disgraces the French tariff, the foreign market is not open to the nation. Several accidental circumstances contributed to aggravate these evils. The harvests of 1855 and 1856 were, in the greater part of France, below the average: they were badly got in, and the want of hands was most severely felt at the critical moment which was to secure the provision of the year. The stores sent to support large bodies of troops employed abroad, but fed in great part from home, were not inconsiderable, and contributed to affect the markets. The failure of the vine for several successive years is a still more serious privation; for whilst it deprives the wine-grower of his income, it deprives the consumer of one of the most essential necessities of life; the common liquor sold in the wine shops of Paris has risen from 60 or 80 to 90 and 100 centimes a litre: the average wholesale price from 35 francs a hectolitre to 57 francs. In the rural districts the difference is far greater, and wine has almost ceased to be the beverage of the people. Brandy is become even more scarce, and for the first time in history large quantities of corn spirit are exported to France from this country for use or re-exportation, after having paid the British excise duty.

The French Government, aware of the perils attending this state of things, and alarmed by the effects of high prices and scarcity on the vast masses of consumers, whom they have inconsiderately encouraged to flock to the towns, resort to artificial means of singular absurdity and extravagance, which serve in reality only to increase the evil. Instead of allowing the scarcity to produce its own natural results, by limiting consumption, they stimulate consumption by a forced reduction of prices. The bakers of Paris were placed under the stricter control of the administration, and compelled to sell flour and bread for less than they were worth, the difference being made up by an allowance from the Ville de Paris, which has thus run several millions into debt. It may here be observed, for the information of those who profess a servile admiration of the imperial institutions, that the governing body of the city of Paris, which acts in the name of that great civic community, is

in reality no corporation at all, but a mere government board appointed to manage the affairs of the city; having, therefore, no rights and no will of its own, but being a mere instrument of the State in the guise of municipal authority. Hence, the Ville de Paris had no choice but to lend itself to these absurdities, and the result is that the government has now some difficulty in finding men who will consent to fill the degraded offices of the civic magistracy.

The price of butchers' meat has also been regulated by authority, though not in the same manner, and the effect of these restrictions on the sale of meat is amusing. The different parts of the animals slaughtered at the *abattoirs* are classed in *categories*, the price of each category being fixed by the police. It, therefore, becomes the interest of the butcher to pass off the meat of inferior animals as the best that can be procured, and the consequence is a general decline in the quality of the meat brought to market; it no longer pays to kill the finest animals, or to fatten them at a great expense, and consequently cow-beef and lean mutton now exercise the ingenuity of the French *cuisine*.

Another cause of distress and expense is the great rise in the price of lodgings and rents throughout Paris. It may readily be conceived that if 300,000 persons have been added to the population of the department of the Seine in the last five years, the difficulty of lodging them is not small. But at the very same time the vast improvements executed in Paris by the Imperial Government have demolished many thousands of the habitations of the poorer classes, and driven them from the centre of the capital to the suburbs. Even there houses are not to be found for these multitudes; and we are assured, on good authority, that during the last winter rents have been paid to the owners of land near the *barrières* for permission to *encamp* without the walls, and thus strange settlements of these Bedouins of civilisation have been formed round the most polished and splendid city in Europe.

Although the pressure arising from these causes has been most intense in Paris and the large towns, it is powerfully felt throughout the country. The drain on provisions and the attraction of the towns has affected the very source of these commodities; they have become scarce and dear, where they had been habitually most abundant and cheap; and probably the unprecedented rise in prices in the rural districts has increased the evil by inducing greater numbers of emigrants to attempt to better their condition in the towns. High prices produced from causes of this nature are of no real advantage,

even to the agricultural classes of the nation, for ere long they are themselves affected by the same tide; and whilst measures are taken to lighten, by artificial means, the immediate burden on the town population, the same influence which attracts larger supplies to the towns subtracts them from the country. Hence, in this scramble, the peasant is exposed to be sacrificed, or at least to be squeezed, in order to provide against the more formidable exactions of the *ouvrier*; and the current which has set in from the rural departments to the towns affords an unanswerable proof that an impression exists among the peasantry in favour of the superior condition and advantages of the townspeople. Statements like that which M. Husson (himself an officer of the Prefecture of the Seine) has just published, are not calculated to diminish this impression. On the contrary, the picture he draws of the favours lavished by absolute power on the inhabitants of the capital would fill with amazement a peasant of the Limousin, of Brittany, or even of Burgundy, inured to the hardships of a different lot, but looking to the Government as the power by which that lot is to be improved.

This contrast, which is forced by the state of the country on the least observant as well as on the most intelligent classes, suggests the last and most instructive lesson we shall draw from these returns. The peasantry of France, in spite of their prejudices and imperfections, are regarded by those who know them well as the most healthy, vigorous, and unspoiled portion of the nation. The Revolution which gave them their independence, which secured to them their property, and which has ended by a signal manifestation of their political power, has not yet depraved their character or corrupted their manners. In fact, although they owe to the Revolution of 1789 the improvement in their condition and many of their present advantages, the removal of their grievances and the satisfaction of their desires has now rendered them the least revolutionary class in the French community. Their passions are more conservative than obstructive, and it is not uncommon to detect amongst them the very same prejudices and the same ignorance which characterised, and perhaps still characterise, the High Tory country gentleman in England. They often display a pride not unbecoming the free possessors of the soil, marred in some degree by an overweening sense of their own importance, and by contempt for those classes of the nobility and the *bourgeoisie*, whose privileges have successively crumbled into the dust. Keen to excess in their dealings, they have not lost that self-respect which manifests itself by honesty and good faith. Throughout the land, from Alsatia to Finistère, and from Picardy to the Pyrenees, the

likeness that pervades these men is so strong, that in any given emergency the presumption is they will feel, think, and act alike; for with them no rival influences of personal ambition arise to divide or arrest the current of their common interest and their common instinct. Hence the wonderful unanimity with which they gave their undivided support to Louis Napoleon in each of his successive appeals by universal suffrage to that vast electoral body; and hence their universal conviction that, whatever may be the merits or the faults of their present ruler, he is at least a ruler of their own making.

The changes which have taken place in France since 1789 had thrown into the hands of the peasantry a large proportion of the land of the country. As every owner of land, whether of a large or of a small estate, has an equal vote, the peasantry hold an overwhelming majority in the franchise. The constitutional monarchy had unwisely debarred this large class of the landholders of France from political power; but by that principle of society which seems to be one of the most deep-seated and irresistible conditions of political existence, no sooner were the existing institutions of the country overthrown, than the supreme power in the State reverted as it were to its source, in the owners of the soil. There, and there alone, the Government of the second Empire has a basis; that is the main, if not the sole, condition of the present tranquil submission of France to a form of sovereignty which has annihilated every semblance of freedom; and the only claim to originality we can discover in the fabric raised by the Emperor Napoleon III., is his discovery that a government may be founded and maintained, for a considerable period of time, by the sole support of the landed peasantry, in spite of the disaffection of the towns, the aversion of the upper ranks, and the ridicule and vituperation of the educated classes. The peasantry were roused by the exercise of universal suffrage to the consciousness of political power; but it would be a complete error to suppose that a wide diffusion of the franchise amongst that class of society tends to free government and liberal principles. In France the result has been just the reverse. Unable to exercise that power by any direct machinery of their own, they delegated it absolutely, and in the most simple form, to one man; and they view without repugnance the uses which may be made of that power against liberties and rights to which they are strangers, provided their own independence and ascendancy be respected, and their own prejudices and passions flattered, by the Head of the State.

If these views of the present political condition of France are

correct, it is evident that the movement of the population disclosed by the returns of the last census is precisely that which is most injurious to the interests and future stability of the Imperial Government, and, indeed, of society itself.

The class of the population, in which the main strength of the Government lies, appears to be decreasing; the class of the population most adverse to its pretensions, most impatient of authority, most difficult to govern in an hour of excitement, is constantly augmented. Every man who quits his native village by the high road to Paris, leaves behind him the better half of his nature, and, above all, those qualities which make him a good subject. He is absorbed into, and identified with, that stormy sea of the great capital, where political agitation, once roused, soon rises to the tempest of revolution. He exchanges the modest existence, the regular but certain employment, and the strict economy of rural life, for the more exciting, precarious, and costly life of town labour. He will never revert to the humble, persevering, and invaluable toil of his rural condition. Instead of living by the careful improvement of his own resources, he becomes a paid servant or workman of the State, chargeable in one form or another on the resources of the country. Should these fail, the chances are that he becomes a recruit in that disorderly army which has more than once triumphed over the regular forces of powerful governments, and at any rate he can no longer be relied on by the Government for support. In fact, if a crisis of real difficulty were to arise, as some day it must arise, the existence in the Department of the Seine of this vast redundant population, brought thither by the inconsiderate munificence of the State, and taught to expect that the State will provide for it all the means of subsistence, is the most formidable danger that can threaten a government.

On the numerical strength of the population of the Empire, and especially on that of the most important part of that population, this absorbing power of Paris and the great towns must continue to produce a mischievous effect. The ordinary rule of societies is held to be, that high wages and abundant food tend to promote marriage and to stimulate the increase of the population. 'The liberal reward of labour,' says Adam Smith, 'as it is the effect of increasing wealth, so it is the cause of increasing population.' But the example before us shows that these propositions must be taken with some reserve. The reward of labour is more liberal in great towns than in rural districts; but this circumstance may be combined with other causes unfavourable to the natural increase of the race. Hence, in Paris the population may be said, on the comparison

of births and deaths, to diminish or to remain stationary; and it can hardly be doubted that the reproductive power of the persons of either sex who are attracted to the capital, is diminished by the positions in which they are placed there. Thus, the same causes which have led to this rapid accumulation in the capital, also tend indirectly to the decline of the population in the rural departments.*

Again, the doctrine of the soundest writers on the theory of population has established the law which connects the increase of the human race with the supply of food; and the tendency of population to outrun the supply of food is one of the chief dangers of society and the chief causes of distress. But as over consumption may arise from numbers, so also it may arise from wealth, or from the prodigal expenditure of capital. It may happen, and we are disposed to think that in France it has happened, that by a sudden development of the resources of large classes in the community, these classes are enabled to eat and drink more food, to purchase food of a better quality, and generally to increase their consumption of the necessaries of life. But unless the supply of these commodities be actually augmented in the same ratio, it follows that the increased consumption by these prosperous classes is inseparably connected with a diminished consumption by the poor,—what is luxury to the former begets scarcity to the latter,—and the burden falls with increased weight on those who are least able to bear it. We have shown that in France the supply and the power of producing food is by no means on the increase. On the contrary, it is diminishing by the withdrawal of labour and capital from agricultural pursuits. But the more the supply declines, the more are men driven to seek to improve their conditions by other employments, and hence the luxury and expenditure which gives so much splendour and activity to the towns, is the very cause which produces many of the symptoms of scarcity and a reduced population in the country.

It is scarcely necessary to follow to its more remote con-

* We may here observe that the increase of population in England and Wales, in the five years and a half which have elapsed since the British Census of 1851, is believed by the Registrar-General to be 1,157,000, that of the population of France being in about the same time 256,000. But the population of France is, in round numbers, double that of England and Wales; and as the increase of population in the latter country is *absolutely* four times and a half greater than the increase in the former country, it follows that *relatively* the increase of population in this period in England and Wales is *nine times* greater than it is in France.

sequences the effects of a state of things so contrary to the ordinary operation of natural causes, and so injurious to many of the chief interests of the community. But we cannot forbear noting the probable consequences of a decline of population in the rural districts, as they affect the State in the two great departments of taxation and of military service.

The taxes levied in the towns of France, whether for municipal or for national purposes, may generally be regarded as taxes on consumption; the taxes levied in the rural districts are taxes on production. It is pretty generally admitted, that although the increasing luxury, expenditure, and capital of the towns may, in some degree, augment the former source of revenue, it is extremely difficult to add a centime to the burdens borne by the latter. Hence, the insurmountable difficulty of making any real addition to the public revenue of the Empire, even during the emergency of the war; and hence the necessity of providing for the whole extraordinary expenses of war by loans, offered on conditions so favourable to the lender and so disadvantageous to the borrower, as to attract from all classes of the population the floating capital of the country. The possession of a paramount political power by the very class which is most impatient of taxation, and least able to pay additional taxes, is an effectual check on the power of the State to augment the legitimate revenue of the Empire; it is, therefore, by the artificial resource of credit that the extraordinary expenditure of the present reign is chiefly supplied.

But this consideration applies with far greater force to the military conscription—a tax on the able-bodied male population itself, borne to a much greater extent by the peasantry who are drawn for service in the Imperial armies than by the townsmen, who find a ground of exemption in their diminutive stature or their enfeebled constitutions. A great military Power like France owes a large portion of her political importance to her power of levying troops; and it is impossible to deny that a diminution of the population in fifty-four rural departments betokens a diminution in the elements of her military strength. Moreover, in proportion as the want of hands is felt in agricultural labour, the military conscription becomes more burdensome to the peasantry. For forty years of peace the annual levy of 80,000 men had gone on with regularity, and the country was satisfied to pay that quota to its military duties; but when, on the outbreak of war, the outstanding contingents of the preceding years were called out, and the levies doubled for the war establishment, the pressure of the conscription began to be

severely felt, and we have very little doubt that the inadequacy of the population to supply by agricultural labour the present wants of the country was one of the social causes which rendered the war unpopular in France, and compelled the Emperor to accelerate its termination. The impatience of the army to return to France was so notorious that it was not thought prudent even to reserve in the East a garrison of occupation until the fulfilment of the Treaty of Peace; and the eagerness of the soldiers to obtain their discharge on their return was not less remarkable. We have no doubt that the French will ever retain their martial spirit and indomitable gallantry if they should be called upon to defend their territory, or to uphold the honour of their flag; but the period of their social history, which rendered them eager combatants and ambitious assailants, is past, and no people are less disposed than the French of the present day to plunge into war, or less able to meet the protracted drain of a European struggle on their population and on their finances. The same remark applies with even greater force to their system for manning the navy. The Government has the power, by means of the maritime conscription, of throwing on board its ships of war the whole nautical population, and this power during the late war was freely used. The effort was successful for a war of short duration, during which the Allied Powers held undisputed possession of the seas; but the pressure on the population of the maritime departments and the coasts and rivers became intolerably severe; the unpopularity of the service is excessive; and if this strain had continued until the existing race of seamen had been used up or exhausted, it is difficult to foresee how any fresh supply of men would have been obtained for the fleet.

We do not hesitate, therefore, to express our conviction that one of the first consequences of the check which the French population has sustained, is to abate the military vehemence of France, and to extinguish the aggressive designs she has at other times entertained against Europe. Napoleon III., more wise in this respect than Napoleon I., has discovered that the nation, in choosing him for its master, meant to choose a pacific ruler; and the celebrated expression '*L'Empire c'est la paix*' was even more true of the social disposition of the nation than of the political intentions of the new Sovereign. In this, as in many other respects, the actual state of the population throws considerable light on the true interests and condition of the people, and it may afford some guide to the uncertain destinies of its future government.

- ART. III.—1. *The Physical Geography of the Sea.* By Lieut. MAURY, U. S. Navy. London and New York: 1856.
2. *Arctic Explorations in the Years 1853, 1854, and 1855.* By Dr. KANE, U. S. Navy. Philadelphia: 1856.
3. *Considérations Générales sur l'Océan Atlantique.* Par PHILIPPE DE KERHALLET. Paris: 1853.

AMONG the many titles to fame of the venerable Humboldt, none is so highly merited or so peculiar to himself, as that earned by his labours on the Physical History and Geography of the Globe. In the earlier days of this Review the teaching of geography, as then understood and practised amongst us, was a dry and barren task; tedious to the teacher, distasteful and of slender profit to the scholar. Bald catalogues of easily forgotten names, (*locorum nuda nomina*, as Pliny calls them,) uninformed by science and scantily illustrated by history, formed the staple of the study. Nor was any part of education more defaced by the coarser mechanism of book-making. Errors of fact, and even of nomenclature, were perpetuated from one edition or compilation to another, with little regard to original accuracy, or to the changes going on in the world. And even where some fragment of history or physical science broke in upon the network of names, it was often of doubtful authenticity, or too partial and detached to give real knowledge or gain hold on the memory. This is not an exaggerated view of the manner in which geography was generally taught in England down to a recent period.*

The more exact study of history had already improved the

* The progress made in the last quarter of a century in the philosophical study of the earth is nowhere more perceptible than in the books of geographical reference to which we have now ready access. At the head of these we have great pleasure in placing Messrs. Fularton's 'Gazetteer of the World,' or, as it is more properly entitled, 'Dictionary of Geographical Knowledge,'—a work which has recently been completed, and which combines to a remarkable extent comprehensive views of the physical geography of the globe with a vast amount of political and statistical information, and all the minuteness and accuracy which is required in a dictionary of places. We know no book of equal excellence on these subjects in any other language. Not less meritorious, though more compendious, are Mr. Keith Johnston's contributions to geographical literature. The *Gazetteer* which bears his name is remarkable for its completeness; and his *Atlas of the United States of America* supplies a deficiency which has long been felt on both sides of the Atlantic.

methods, and extended the sphere of geography, before physical science had fairly annexed itself to the subject, creating new associations, of high interest in themselves, and fertile in their influence on the condition and welfare of mankind. We have spoken of Humboldt as the philosopher who especially contributed to the establishment of Physical Geography as a branch of science. The natural phenomena, indeed, upon which it is founded, being ever present and patent to observation, could not have escaped record; and this record was becoming continually more copious, through its connexion with other branches of natural knowledge. But there was yet wanting a clear specification of the scope and objects of the science thus gradually evolving itself; and of the methods best fitted for their attainment. It is here that we owe to Humboldt's peculiar genius, aided by the vast resources derived from travel and personal observation, not merely the definition of the objects in view, but their illustration by those various writings and researches which will carry his name to posterity. The globe has been to him much more than a mere superficial delineation of land and sea, of mountains and rivers, of terrestrial divisions and other human landmarks. His researches have comprised, under a closer and more connected view, those great physical characters of the earth's surface, through which alone we can learn the changes it has undergone or is yet undergoing; — the physical elements and forces which have been concerned, or are still active, in producing these changes; — and the agents and means by which change is limited and general stability maintained.

In assigning to Humboldt the foremost place among those who have given to Physical Geography the name and character of a science, we must add that this great field has since been full of labourers, zealous in their work, and bringing to it numerous aids and appliances furnished by other branches of natural knowledge. Scarcely, in truth, is there one which has not been made to contribute, directly or indirectly, to Physical Geography in the full meaning of the term. When earth, ocean, and atmosphere all come within its sphere, as well as those great and mysterious forces, — gravitation, heat, light, and electricity, — by which these several elements of our planet are so powerfully and incessantly acted upon, it will be seen how closely the subject is linked with every other research into the world of nature around us. Our countrywoman, Mrs. Somerville, has well expanded these relations in her admirable volumes on Physical Geography. The Physical Atlas of Berghaus, a valuable German work, preceded the publication in this country of the more extensive and elaborate 'Physical Atlas of Natural Phenomena' by Mr. A.

Keith Johnston, of which it would be difficult to speak in terms above the mark of its actual merits, embracing every part of the subject it delineates to the eye as well as the mind, and far better than by any verbal description, those complex relations of physical phenomena on the globe, which are the true foundation of Physical Geography.

Of all branches of science, none comes so largely in aid of our knowledge of the present condition of the globe as the wonderful conclusions 'Geology has drawn from the condition of the globe in former ages. Such are, the power obtained, through the study of fossil remains, of identifying strata in localities the most remote, and thus fixing the common epoch of certain states or changes of the crust of the globe;—the facts discovered, proving the gradual upheaval of portions of the earth's surface, and the slow depression of others;—the proofs from the inclination and contortions of strata, from the alterations of the older strata, and from the position and elevation of the unstratified rocks, that various changes, more abrupt and violent, have occurred from subterranean forces;—the evidence derived from the direction, parallelism, and other aspects of mountain chains, as to periods of contemporaneous elevation—the influences upon climate of lands elevated above the sea or depressed below it;—and further, the whole history of that coral creation, by which, under the slow working of microscopic forms of animal life, islands and reefs are raised from the depth of the ocean, to become the habitation of other and higher existences.

We have thus far spoken of Physical Geography in its largest acceptation. But the rapid extension of all science of late years has naturally led to subdivisions, ever becoming more special, as facts have multiplied and new fields have been laid open. Even in those profound researches of our own time, directed to prove the intimate physical connexion, if not identity, of certain of the great agents which govern the movements and changes of our globe, and probably of other animated worlds, and thus to concentrate physical facts and laws within a closer circle, these divisions are still necessary to guide to ulterior labour, and to give method and precision to its results.

Physical geography has just been submitted to this process of division; and the phrase of 'Physical Geography of the Sea,' proposed by Humboldt to express it, is the title of the first of the works now before us. Under this title, its author, Lieutenant Maury of the United States navy, includes all that concerns the great domain of waters over the globe—the oceans, seas, and basin lakes into which they are dis-

tributed;—their various depth, temperature, and saltness;—the currents which permanently or periodically pervade them;—the phenomena of the tides; the phenomena of winds, whether constant or irregular, whether the gentle and steady trade breeze, or the hurricane and cyclone;—the law of evaporation belonging to different latitudes of the watery world;—the less known, yet certain agency of magnetic or electrical forces;—and the mutual influence of ocean and land in all these physical actions and changes. This summary statement shows how vast and various are the objects in the division of science thus proposed. We find further reason for its adoption in the importance of all these objects to the principles and practice of navigation; a consideration of supreme weight in these days, when the ocean in its every part is covered with ships; shaped in new forms, moved by new forces, destined to new shores, and seeking to attain by new routes the highest speed of transit. Facts and phenomena, before unobserved, or barren of result, are now eagerly appropriated, and, by the science and ingenuity of man, made to minister to the great purposes of human intercourse over the globe. The ocean, once an obstacle, has become the high road of nations. If steam has worked its wonders on the land, so it has also on the sea; and under a form surpassing, in grandeur of force and effect, all the other operations of this great agent of human power. Iron, that material which ministers in such endless ways to the uses of man, has scarcely less efficiency on the ocean than on land; and we have at this moment in progress before our eyes, a gigantic application of it to the building and propulsion of what may better be called a moving maritime City than a ship; which, if successful in the issue, may effect mighty changes in the course of commerce and navigation over all the seas of the globe.

Acquiescing fully, then, in the name and distinction of 'Physical Geography of the Sea,' we may add that we consider Lieut. Maury a worthy interpreter of the great phenomena included under this title. Attached as Superintendent to the National Observatory at Washington, he has used this honourable position, with much zeal and high intelligence, in forwarding objects of singular importance to his own country and to ours, and of general interest to all nations of the world. He published some years ago his 'Wind and Current Charts,' a valuable precursor of the present volume. To his assiduity, working through and seconded by his government, we owe that conference held at Brussels in August, 1853, in which were found representatives from England, France, the United States,

Russia, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, and Portugal, occupied, at the very time when war sternly impended over Europe, in organising plans for those co-operative labours on the ocean, those methodical records of winds, currents, tides, and temperature, which provide for the peaceful interests and progress of commercial navigation over the globe. Austria, Prussia, the Hanse Towns, Spain, and Brazil, subsequently offered their co-operation in the same great scheme. With observations thus multiplied on every side,—the log even of the common merchant brig being admitted to its share in the work,—facts will speedily become numerous enough to yield results of the highest certainty and value. The method of averages, now so potent an aid to all research, has especial application here, furnishing a secure road to conclusions which no detached observations could reach.

Though Lieut. Maury claims all seas for his province, the larger portion of his volume is occupied with the great ocean which separates the Old from the New World; a very natural effect of the supreme importance of the Atlantic in the commerce of nations, and of the greater knowledge thus attained of all its physical phenomena. It will be seen that we have given place on our list to another work, by Captain Philippe de Kerhallet of the French Navy, having more especial relation to this ocean; less scientific in its character than that of Lieut. Maury, and less animated and vigorous in its descriptive part, but nevertheless containing much that is of great practical value for navigation.

We place further before our readers the title of another book, 'Arctic Explorations in the Years 1853, 1854, and 1855, by Dr. Kane,' partly because it is the latest record of discovery in the physical geography of the sea, partly because this record is contained in one of the most interesting and pathetic narratives it has ever fallen to our lot to peruse. The discovery itself has close kindred in many ways with others before made in the same stern regions of ice, winter, darkness, and desolation. What had been before described as a closed inlet of the sea, at the northern extremity of Baffin's Bay, was found to be a strait, leading due northwards, and followed by Dr. Kane's party—with ship and sledge, and human eye stretching beyond,—to latitude 82°; leaving a distance thence to the North Pole scarcely exceeding that between London and Aberdeen. At this remote point it is that we obtain the great result of this perilous and painful voyage—the spectacle of a wide open sea, stretching northwards beyond the dense barrier of ice, which jams up the entrance of the strait; and giving the best evidence

we yet possess that such sea spreads freely forwards to the pole. We are bound to say, however, that this notion of an open polar sea still awaits further confirmation. Dr. Kane himself, retained by illness in his vessel, was not of the exploring party which achieved the result just stated. One of the most intelligent of his crew, Mr. Morton, who had previous experience in Arctic Seas, and a young Esquimaux taken up at the Danish settlements, were the two persons who, in June 1854, from a promontory 400 or 500 feet high, looked upon what they conceived to be the open ocean towards the north. It is Morton's affirmation that in the wide horizon thus obtained, 'not a speck of ice could be seen;' and marine birds appeared in great numbers, which are rarely found except where there is a sufficient expanse of open water to yield them food. Morton adds in his Report of this extremely high latitude, 'I cannot imagine what becomes of the ice. A strong current sets it almost constantly to the south; but from altitudes of more than 500 feet I saw only narrow strips of ice, with great spaces of open water from ten to fifteen miles in breadth between them. It must therefore either go to an open space in the north or dissolve.' This remarkable observation corresponds with a passage of Lieutenant Maury's book on the currents which force their way through or beneath the ice to the Polar Sea. It must, however, be remembered that all distant ocular observations on fields of ice or water in the Arctic regions are fallacious. The atmosphere generally renders it difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish ice from water at a distance of more than ten or twelve miles, and there is no proof of open sea but actual navigation.

The publication of these most interesting and most painful volumes has occurred at a seasonable moment to warn the British Government and the public against the further prosecution of these inhuman and abortive expeditions; and we rejoice that the Admiralty have refused to sanction a fresh search for the remains of Franklin's ships. But meanwhile Dr. Kane himself has added another illustrious name to the list of Arctic victims, having sunk under the effects of the frightful sufferings he had to endure. It is afflicting to think of the courage and skill which has been wasted in these efforts. Dr. Kane's narrative betokens throughout those peculiar qualities of head and heart which preeminently fit a man for such an undertaking—high intelligence, great firmness and patience, and a kind and genial temperament. The hardships he and his seventeen companions underwent during the 18 months they were pent up in the ice, from which they only escaped by the abandon-

ment of their vessel, exceed perhaps those of any living navigators in these regions:—we recoil from associating them with the imagination of what may have been the condition of our own brave countrymen whose loss we have too much reason to believe in and deplore. These volumes are illustrated with a degree of taste which does credit to American art; and they have the merit of a clear, unaffected style, with much power of graphic narrative, whether applied to the scenery of these Arctic regions, or to the toils and dangers undergone, or to the social state of the small body of men Dr. Kane commanded, if we may so speak of the strange life of darkness, cold, sickness, and starvation which was endured during the two long winters of this voyage.

Recurring now to the principal volume before us, we think it right to premise a few remarks upon the method of this work, and upon some points in its execution. Considered as a scientific treatise, Lieut. Maury has not done full justice to himself, or to his subject, by his manner of dealing with it. We are unwilling to be hypercritical where there is so much real merit, but it is impossible not to see in his work a desultory desire for novelty, occasionally going beyond the bounds of true inductive science; and venting itself in a phraseology which loses its force and effect by being too sedulous to attain them. With a little more constraint upon his speculations, and a clearer separation of fact and hypothesis, he would be a valuable scientific writer: with somewhat less intention of fine writing, he would be an eloquent one. We refrain from giving passages to illustrate or justify these criticisms; believing, from the evident candour of the author, that he will appreciate their motive, and apply them to future editions of his work as far as this can reasonably be done.

It is with reluctance that we advert to another characteristic of this volume:—we mean the very frequent and incautious reference to passages in Scripture; not solely for illustration, but even as authority for physical truths, or argument for hypotheses still unproved. Lieut. Maury is evidently a man of strong and sincere religious feelings, and we honour the earnestness with which he expresses them. But he unhappily does not see that in forcing Scripture to the interpretation of physical facts, he is mistaking the whole purport of the sacred Books, misappropriating their language, and discrediting their evidence on matters of deep concern, by applying it to objects and cases of totally different nature. This *pia deflexio*, as it has been termed in instances of still more serious import, must ever be regarded as an injury

done to real religion; and we are anxious now, as at all times, to enter our remonstrance against it.

The passages thus misapplied are chiefly taken from the Old Testament — the Psalms, the Book of Job, &c., — which, in the pictures they give of the works and wonders of creation, need borrow nothing of that science they do not profess, to render them to all ages the most sublime eulogies of the power and wisdom of the Creator. One example only we will cite, to show how much of error may enter into this loose and ill-judged method of dealing with scriptural authority. After a passage, too laboriously ornate in its diction, where our author speaks of the allusions in the Bible to the laws of nature, as involving, under figurative language, hidden meanings which are only disclosed by the later revelations of science, he quotes among other instances the striking text from Job (xxxviii. 31.), ‘*Canst thou bind the sweet influence of the Pleiades?*’ or, as he gives it, ‘*Canst thou tell the sweet influence of the Pleiades?*’ And this sublime but obscure interrogation he considers as solved by the recent observations and views of Professor Mädler of Dorpat, which make the star of Alcyone in the Pleiades to be the centre of gravity of that vast stellar system, to which our globe belongs as a small and subordinate planet.

Here we must first remark that he is obviously ignorant of the controversy as to this text, which has engaged the learning of Gesenius, Rosenmüller, Mason-Good, Herder, and many other scholars; leaving the interpretation still difficult and uncertain. He seems himself to have quoted from some translation which doubtfully takes half the sense from the Septuagint, (Συνῆκας δὲ τὸν δεσμὸν Πλειάδος;) omitting altogether the conception of a *link* or *binding together*, which is kept in our authorised translation, and which so happily applies to the close and beautiful aggregation of stars in this group; — an aggregation of such kind that astronomers have calculated the chances to be more than half a million to one that they could not have been thus set in the heavens by accident alone.

The latter part of the passage in question is also of doubtful interpretation; and we may well ask therefore whether this is a text upon which to establish or confirm a conclusion of physical fact? But, further, our author assumes in his argument that Mädler’s view of the Pleiades, as the centre of the sidereal system, is ‘all but proved;’ forgetting or ignorant that few astronomers have recognised it as more than a magnificent problem awaiting solution from future research; and that Sir J. Herschel especially has given a reason for distrusting the doctrine, in the distance of the Pleiades from the plane of the Milky Way;

which plane must probably coincide with and define that of any general movement of rotation in the stellar system, should such exist. The science therefore of this comment is as ambiguous as the scriptural quotation to which it is appended.

It may seem that we have dwelt too long on this matter; but we must repeat in justification our earnest desire that the authority of Scripture should not thus rashly be pledged to facts and opinions with which it has no concern, save in so far as it describes the visible manifestations of creative wisdom, beauty, and power. The example just given we consider to be an apt illustration of the errors usually committed in this method of argument. Though less frequent than formerly, we still find them in some controversies of recent date, gaining a prompt influence over the public mind, as injurious, we believe, to the interests of true religion as of the sciences thus forced into contact with it.

We come now, and with more satisfaction, to the legitimate object of Lieut. Maury's work,—the great watery empire of the globe; the aspects and phenomena of oceans and seas; their various physical relations, as well to the continents and islands they encircle as to the atmosphere incumbent over all; and that farther relation they bear to the efforts of human industry, intrepidity, and skill, which have rendered the most distant paths of ocean open and assured to all nations of the earth. The Atlantic is the especial object of our author's labours; and accordingly we find the first parts of his volume occupied almost exclusively with this ocean. Though we may explain the preference, we cannot wholly acquiesce in it as preliminary to a physical history of the sea at large. The subject requires to be prefaced by those more general views of the distribution and relative configuration of water and land over the globe, which form the very foundation of physical geography, and are fertile in curious and important conclusions. Facts which, if stated at all, are loosely and incongruously scattered over the volume, ought to have been put before the reader in some connected form, as indicating the nature and magnitude of the objects concerned. Lieut. Maury plunges him at once into mid-ocean, without compass or guidance over its world of waters. A greater familiarity with the writings of Humboldt, Ritter, Von Buch, and other authors, principally German, who have done so much for the study of physical geography, would have furnished both model and materials for a preliminary chapter, such as we desire for a work bearing this title and dealing with objects so vast and various in kind.

We may cursorily state here, in illustration, a few of those

general facts, to which our author might fitly have given the priority suggested. First, the proportion of sea to land, — determined as nearly three to one ; or, in other words, that three fourths of the surface of the globe is covered with water. Then, the fact (important in its suggestion of a disparity in the forces which have acted on the two hemispheres) of the great excess of land in the northern hemisphere over that of the southern, being in the ratio of 11 to 4 ; from which condition arise the curious results that only 1-27th part of existing land has land diametrically opposite to it in the other hemisphere, and that the line of the equator, as it girdles the earth, rests on the ocean for five-sixths of its length. Another mode of estimating the properties and local relations of land and sea is obtained by halving the globe longitudinally on the meridian of the Canaries ; when a much larger proportion of sea will be found on the western half or hemisphere so defined, than on the eastern. The main fact of the great predominance of water on the surface of the globe being thus proved, and its mean depth, as we shall see hereafter, approximately determined, we reach other conclusions, of high interest to almost every part of physical science. We will notice only one of these, in which geological theory both past and prospective is more especially concerned. The *mean elevation* above the sea level, of all the land on the globe — islands as well as continents, mountains as well as plains — is estimated by Humboldt at somewhat less than 1000 feet. The mean depth of the great oceans of our planet is calculated by Laplace, from the tides and other phenomena, to be at least 21,000 feet. Thus, allowing full margin for errors, the entire submergence of the land might take place, leaving the central solid mass of the earth every where deeply covered with waters — an elliptical globe of ocean, moving still under the governance of the same sublime laws which had before guided its path through surrounding space.

This is enough to show what we should have desired as a foreground to the topics of Lieut. Maury's work. There is undoubtedly much to justify his partiality for the Atlantic as a subject for illustration ; and we shall follow his example by limiting our remarks still more exclusively to what concerns this great Ocean, — a volume itself in the 'physical geography' of the sea. Indeed our author devotes his first two chapters to a single current of the Atlantic, but this current, under the name of the Gulf-stream, includes physical conditions so remarkable, that we cannot blame the priority thus given to its history. To use his own words : —

‘There is a river in the ocean. In the severest droughts it never fails, and in the mightiest floods it never overflows. Its banks and its bottom are of cold water, while its current is of warm. The Gulf of Mexico is its fountain, and its mouth is in the Arctic Seas. It is the Gulf-stream. There is in the world no other such majestic flow of waters. Its current is more rapid than the Mississippi or the Amazon, and its volume more than a thousand times greater. Its waters, as far out from the Gulf as the Carolina coasts, are of an indigo blue. They are so distinctly marked, that this line of junction with the common sea-water may be traced by the eye. Often one-half of the vessel may be perceived floating in Gulf-stream water, while the other half is in common water of the sea; so sharp is the line and such the want of affinity between these waters; and such, too, the reluctance, so to speak, on the part of those of the Gulf-Stream to mingle with the common water of the sea.’

This eloquent passage delineates, in terms happily chosen, some of the most striking features of this wonderful stream. But there are yet others to be noted; and we shall dwell somewhat in detail on a natural phenomenon thus remarkable: one, moreover, in which we, the people of the British Isles, have a direct and momentous interest, as well in reference to commerce and navigation, as to its certain and various influences on the climate under which we live.

The general description of the Gulf-stream, apart from any present question as to its sources, is that of a vast and rapid ocean-current, issuing from the basin of the Mexican Gulf and Caribbean Sea, doubling the southern cape of Florida; pressing forwards to the north-east, in a line almost parallel to the American coast; touching on the southern borders of the Grand Banks of Newfoundland, and at some seasons partially passing over them; thence, with increasing width and diffusion, traversing the whole breadth of the Atlantic, with a central direction towards the British Isles; and finally losing itself, by still wider diffusion, in the Bay of Biscay, on our own shores, and upon the long line of the Norwegian coasts. Its identity in physical characters is preserved throughout the many thousand miles of its continuous flow—the only change undergone is that of degree. As its waters gradually commingle with those of the surrounding sea, their deep blue tint declines, their high temperature diminishes, the speed with which they press forwards abates. But taking the stream in its total course, it well warrants the vivid description of our author, and the name he bestows upon it of ‘a river in the ocean.’ This epithet (bringing to memory the *ῥοή Ωκεανοῖο* of Homer), is, in truth, singularly appropriate to this vast current; so constant and continuous in

its course; and so strangely detached from the great mass of ocean waters; which, while seemingly cleft asunder to give path to its first impulse, are yet ever pressing upon it, gradually impairing its force and destroying its individuality.

The maximum of velocity, where the stream quits the narrow channel of Bemini, which compresses its egress from the gulf, is about 4 miles an hour. Off Cape Hatteras in North Carolina, where it has gained a breadth of 75 miles, the velocity is reduced to 3 miles. On the parallel of the Newfoundland Banks it is further reduced to $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles an hour, and this gradual abatement of force is continued across the Atlantic. The temperature of the current undergoes similar change. The highest observed is about 85° Fah. Between Cape Hatteras and Newfoundland, though lessened in amount, the warmth of the stream in winter is still 25° or 30° above that of the ocean through which it flows. Nor is this heat wholly lost when it reaches, and is spread over, the coasts of Northern Europe. The waters, thus constantly flowing to us from the tropical regions, bring warmth, as well as abundant moisture, to our own islands; and Ireland especially, upon which they more directly impinge, doubtless derives much of its peculiarity of climate, its moisture, verdure, and abundant vegetation, from this source. Were it needful to seek proof of the permanence of the great natural phenomenon of which we are speaking, we might find it in those curious passages of ancient geographers, — Pomponius Mela, and J. Solinus Polyhistor, for example, — which describe the peculiarities of the Irish soil and climate eighteen centuries ago, almost as we should depict them now. But the influence of the Gulf-stream does not stop even here. The climate it may be said to convey is diffused, more or less, over the whole Norwegian coast; the aspects and produce of which singularly contrast with those of the corresponding latitudes in North America, Greenland, and Siberia. Other causes doubtless contribute to this effect; but none, we apprehend, so largely or unceasingly.

The influence of the temperature of the Gulf-stream upon animal life in the ocean is very curious. The whale so sedulously shuns its warm waters, as almost to indicate their track by its absence; while yet abundantly found on each side of it. The physical reasons are doubtless the same which prevent this great marine mammal from ever crossing the equator from one hemisphere to the other—a fact now well ascertained. The various species of fish, which are firm and of excellent flavour in the colder belt of sea upon the American coast, lose all their good qualities when taken out of the Gulf-stream, running

closely parallel to it. On the other hand, the more delicate marine productions, whether animal or vegetable, which multiply and prosper by warmth, are redundant in the Gulf-stream, even after it has quitted the tropical regions whence its heat is derived. The food is thus matured for the whale field of the Azores, where this huge denizen of the seas flourishes in colder waters amidst the abundance so provided.

Lieut. Maury describes yet other peculiarities of this wonderful current. Its waters are found to be warmest at or near the surface, cooling gradually downwards, so as to render it probable that there is a bed or cushion of cold water between them and the solid earth lying below. Again, the surface of the stream is shown to be not strictly a plane; but having its axis or central portion raised somewhat higher than the level of the adjoining Atlantic; thus giving it a sort of roof-shaped outline, and causing the surface water to flow off on each side. The existence of such surface current has been proved by boats floated near the centre of the stream, which drift either to the east or west, according to the side of the axis on which they may be. This curious fact has been attributed to the central waters of the current being warmest, and, therefore, of least specific gravity. It may be so; but we cannot altogether discard another physical cause; viz., the enormous lateral compression exercised upon the stream by the ocean waters through which it forces its way; tending to *heap it up* towards the axial line. Those who have beheld the wonderful spectacle of the Niagara River, three miles below the falls, so urged and compressed into a narrow ravine, that the middle of the stream rises twelve or thirteen feet above the sides, will be able to conceive this hydrodynamic influence, even on the wide scale of operation which we have now before us.

There is some evidence that the waters of the Gulf-stream, when emerging from the Caribbean Sea, are saltier than those of the Northern Atlantic through which they flow. But as the difference scarcely exceeds half a per cent., we hesitate in believing, with Lieut. Maury, that this greater saltness is the sole source of the deep blue colour they assume. We receive too with some distrust his speculations on what he considers the probable '*galvanic qualities*' of this great stream. We have little doubt, indeed, that the electrical element pervading, in one or other of its forms, the whole material world — giving motion and change to masses as well as molecules, and evolved or altered itself by every such motion and change — may have some concern, as cause or effect, in the natural phenomenon before us. But we perceive at the present time so much tend-

ency to make use of this great power as the basis of vague and fruitless speculation, that we are always suspicious in the outset, when we find its agency invoked to solve a physical problem. In the present instance we see no especial reason for having recourse to it. The physical conditions of the Gulf-stream—its definite direction, its force, its temperature, its saltness, its relation to Atlantic winds and storms, and its tardy intermingling with the mass of ocean—may be referred, with more or less probability, to other natural causes in certain and constant operation. We cannot exclude electricity from the number, but we must not invoke it on the slender evidence which our author places before us.

These considerations lead us to the theory of the Gulf-stream; a matter on which a good deal has been written; and speculations put forward on very insufficient proof. Such is, the early opinion that it owes its origin to the river waters of the Mississippi, forcing a sea current before them out of the Gulf-basin—an opinion at once refuted by the utter disproportion between the alleged cause and the observed effect. It would, in fact, be the case of 300 volumes of water put into rapid motion by one volume only—such, according to Livingstone's careful estimate, being about the proportion of the gulf to the river stream. Another hypothesis, again, to which the names of Dr. Franklin and Major Rennell give some sanction, assigns a higher level—a *heaping up*, as it were, of the waters in the Gulf of Mexico, in effect of those forced into this great basin by the trade-winds of the Atlantic; thereby giving to the Gulf-stream the character of an immense river descending from this higher level to a lower one. Lieut. Maury suggests, we think, valid objections to this hypothesis; and even contends, from the relative depth of the stream in the Narrows of Bemini and of Hatteras, that instead of *descending*, its bed represents the surface of an inclined plane with a descent from north to south, *up* which plane the lower depths of the stream must ascend. We are bound to say that he does not replace, by any complete theory, the opinions which he thus annuls. Nor is it, in truth, easy to frame one which shall meet all the conditions required, seeing the present imperfect state of our knowledge of the mutual influence and action of the mighty agents concerned in such phenomena—the ocean, the atmosphere, the rotation of the earth on its axis, the change of seasons, the tides, the heat and cold of different regions, and possibly magnetic or electrical influences, of the obscurity of which we have already spoken. All who are familiar with the science of Hydrodynamics and the theory of waves, know that these subjects involve problems requiring for their solution the

highest mathematical power, based upon the most exact experiment and observation; questions which have exercised the genius of Euler, Lagrange, Poisson, Prony, Cauchy, Weber, Venturi, and in our own country, of Brindley, Smeaton, Young, Scott, Russell, &c. The theory of the Gulf-stream has close connexion in many points with these high problems, while at the same time complicated by its manifest relation to the great natural agents just enumerated.

We must, then, excuse in our author his somewhat desultory view of a phenomenon, of which no single or simple explanation can rightly be given. It is certain, from the permanent characters of the Gulf-stream, that he is correct in treating of it as part of a great *circuit* of waters in the Atlantic, determined and directed by natural causes of constant operation. One main influence we may presume to be, the tendency of the polar and equatorial waters to exchange and equalise their temperature by currents flowing at different depths through the ocean; a condition certain to exist, and well illustrated by the phenomena of those constant or periodical winds, which fulfil a similar object, by maintaining the needful balance of temperature in the great atmospheric sea around us. Nor is this reference to the trade-winds one of analogy only. We cannot doubt that they are concerned in keeping up the flow of those vast equatorial currents which, traversing the Atlantic from the African coasts, are pressed into the Caribbean Sea and Mexican Gulf on their southern side; and sweeping round this great basin and its islands, are mainly discharged through that narrow passage between Cuba and Florida, where the name of the Gulf-stream is first attached to the current. All its characteristics may best be explained under this general view. If a mass of waters be constantly thrown into the Gulf, a mass of waters must as constantly find exit from it. If the exit be narrow, the force of the stream will be proportionally augmented, by the unceasing pressure from behind; rendering it powerful and persistent enough to cleave the waters of the ocean; making a return path for itself to the more northern parts of the eastern hemisphere, and carrying thither the warmth derived from the eternal summer of the equatorial seas.

We can have little doubt that this outline conveys the true theory of the Gulf-stream; associating it broadly with those great currents of circulation over the globe, which we know must be the certain effect of differences of temperature, but which may in part also depend on the diurnal rotation of the earth affecting the rate of motion and direction of such currents as they flow through different latitudes. The Arctic current

setting into the Atlantic from Baffin's Bay, and transporting huge icebergs to be dissolved by the warmer seas of the South, is well known as a branch of one of these circuits. The existence of a similar circulation of waters in the Pacific—the other great ocean which stretches from pole to pole of the globe—though less defined in its details, occurs in confirmation of this view. It is more directly corroborated by the old experiment of casting bottles into the sea containing dates of place and time; which transported in silent, slow, but certain course, give information to watchful observers on distant seas or shores. These mute interpreters of natural phenomena often render better service to science than the thoughts or theories of man. The chart drawn up by Admiral Beechy, representing the tracks of more than a hundred bottles, shows that all the equatorial waters of the Atlantic tend westwards towards the Mexican Gulf, to issue thence in the Gulf-stream. Those thrown overboard in mid-ocean, or on any part of the African coast, have been found, after a certain lapse of time, either in the West Indies, or on the British shores, or floating in the course of the Gulf-stream between. There is even reason to believe that some of these bottles have been discovered on their second circuit; arrested probably on the coasts of Spain by the drift southwards, carried along the African coast into the equatorial seas, and thence again across the Atlantic to the Gulf of Mexico. The first among the valuable plates appended to Lieut. Maury's work, clearly shows the course thus indicated, and illustrates the whole scheme of the mighty currents we have been describing.

Whenever a circuit of waters is thus formed, we have every reason, from tidal and other analogies, to look for an intermediate or central space, comparatively calm and motionless. And such a space is actually found to exist within this great Ocean whirlpool. The 'Mar de Sargasso,' as the Spanish navigators termed the central portion of the Atlantic, stretching westwards from the Canaries and Cape Verd Islands,—a surface fifteen times greater than that of Great Britain—may be described as a vast stagnant pool, receiving the drift seaweed, which the surrounding currents fling into it, and generating on its calm surface what has been well called 'an oceanic meadow' of seaweed, the *fucus natans* of botanists. It is in this tract of sea that we find such wonderful species of fuci as the *Macrocystis pyrifera*—having stems from 1000 to 1500 feet in length, and but a finger's size in thickness, branching upwards into filaments like packthread. This vast domain of marine vegetable life is the receptacle, as indeed are the waters

of the ocean generally, of an equal profusion of animal existence—from the minute luminiferous organisms, which, to borrow Humboldt's phrase, 'convert every wave into a crest 'of light,' to those larger forms of life, many of which derive nutriment from the waters alone, thus richly impregnated with living animal matter. Reason and imagination are equally confounded by the effort to conceive these hosts of individual existences—*cette richesse effrayante*, as Cuvier terms it,—generated or annihilated at every passing instant of time. No scheme of numbers can reach them, even by approximation; and science is forced to submit its deductions to the general law, that all the materials of organic life are in a state of unceasing change, displacement and replacement, under new forms and altered functions, for purposes which we must believe to be wisely designed, but which transcend all human intelligence.

It is interesting to possess a record of this Mar de Sargasso from the pen of the great mariner who first traversed it on his way to the discovery of a new world. In a letter written by Columbus in 1498, he relates that in each voyage from Spain to the Indies, he found, about 100 nautical miles to the west of the Azores, a wonderful change in the aspect of the ocean; so sudden, too, that he uses the word *raya* to mark the line of boundary. The sea became at once calm and still, scarcely ever moved by a breeze, but so suddenly and strangely matted over with seaweed as to suggest instant danger to the ships from running upon shoal banks. Nearly four centuries have elapsed since these phenomena were present to the eager and observant eye of Columbus; and they yet continue as they then were. The same currents sweep round the basin of the Atlantic; the same stagnant and weedy sea still exists within the circuit of waters thus formed. How changed, meanwhile, the aspect of man's existence on the shores which bound this ocean; and how certain the greater changes during the ages which lie before us! Many of these changes, and such as may count among the mightiest now in progress, are due to the Atlantic itself, and to that permanence of its physical characters which we have been describing. Not only has it served to the intercommunication of the two hemispheres, but it may almost be said to have created the western, by the tide of human emigration carried across from the old world to the new. Some of the greatest problems in government and social existence are awaiting their eventual solution in the races thus transplanted; and especially in the powerful nation, our own offspring, established on the wide and fertile continent of the West.

We cannot touch upon this vast topic of human transit over

the Atlantic, whether for commerce or migration, without recurring once more to the history of the Gulf-stream. Though in practical navigation its influence must often have been felt, yet this fact was scarcely recognised or distinctly recorded before the time of Franklin, whose sagacity, applied to certain special cases, showed him at once the value of a more exact knowledge of all belonging to this great current. One of these cases is curious enough to deserve mention. When in London, in 1770, he was consulted as to a memorial sent from Boston to the Lords of the Treasury, complaining that the packets from Falmouth were generally a fortnight longer in reaching Boston, than common traders from London to Rhode Island, a passage fully 300 miles longer. Captain Folger, a Nantucket whaler, who happened to be then in London, was questioned by Franklin, and furnished him with the true explanation. The Rhode Island traders were acquainted with the Gulf-stream, and kept out of it. The captains of the English packets, from ignorance or carelessness, or possibly seduced by the more genial temperature of this southern course, ran their vessels into the current and *against it*; making a difference in some parts of their voyage of not less than fifty or sixty miles in the daily run, besides the loss incurred from sailing in a lower latitude. Dr. Franklin made Folger, whose experience taught him to avoid a stream in which whales are never found, trace out on a chart the course of this ocean current, had it engraved, and sent copies to the Falmouth captains. These gentlemen, wedded to their old ways, or perhaps despising their informant, took no notice of the suggestion, and went on as before.

Franklin was also the first to indicate the temperature of the Gulf-stream as a valuable aid to the navigation of the Atlantic, especially on the American coasts; the dividing line between the warm stream and the cold waters of the ocean which hem it in, being so precise as well as constant, that the longitude may often safely be inferred from it. Lieut. Maury affirms, and we doubt not with truth, that this dividing line never changes its position in longitude as much as mariners then erred in their reckoning. He gives us also a very curious account of the relation of the Gulf-stream to the storms and hurricanes of this ocean, to which is due their frequent character of rotatory storms or *cyclones*; a name well adapted to the remarkable phenomenon so described. One passage here we will transcribe from our author.

‘I am not prepared to maintain that the Gulf-stream is really the “Storm King” of the Atlantic, which has power to control the march

of every gale that is raised there; but the course of many gales has been traced from the place of their origin directly to this stream. Gales that take their rise on the coast of Africa, and even as far down on that side as the parallel of 10° or 15° north latitude, have, it is shown by an examination of log-books, made straight for the Gulf-stream:—joining it, they have then been known to turn about, and travelling with this stream, to recross the Atlantic, and so reach the shores of Europe. In this way the tracks of storms have been traced out and followed for a week or ten days. Their path is marked by wreck and disasters. At the meeting of the American Association in 1854, Mr. Redfield mentioned one which he had traced out, and in which no less than seventy odd vessels had been wrecked, dismasted, or damaged.'

Another storm, the direction of which is delineated in Plate x. of this volume, commenced more than a thousand miles from the Gulf-stream, made a straight course for it, and travelled with it for many successive days, under the conditions of a whirlwind or cyclone. A fearful disaster, due to one of these hurricanes, occurred in 1853, to the steam ship 'San-Francisco,' carrying a regiment of United States troops from New York to California. Overtaken by the storm in crossing the Gulf-stream, 179 souls, officers and men, were swept overboard and perished. In this case, the knowledge possessed of the stream, its limits, direction, velocity, &c., greatly aided what was done for the discovery and relief of the unfortunate ship in question. The import of these and many similar facts to the future guidance of Atlantic navigation will readily be understood. It may be hard to account for them in theory, but their practical value cannot be doubtful or mistaken.

Intending, as we have already said, to confine our remarks chiefly to that ocean, the Atlantic, on which Lieut. Maury himself best loves to expatiate, we shall follow him more cursorily through the other parts of his volume. The third, fourth, and fifth chapters of his work relate to the Atmosphere, in its various connexion with the physical geography of the sea, as expressed by the phenomena of winds, of evaporation, of rains, of fogs, of temperature, and of electrical changes—a vast subject, and not less complex than vast. Multiplied though all its records have been of late years, and made more minute and accurate as well as numerous, Meteorology cannot yet take its place among the exact sciences. We have just named some of the topics it includes; but there are yet others, which mix with and complicate all the results of observation. The weight of the air is one of these; an element involved as effect or cause in

almost all other atmospheric changes, and deeply concerned in any theory of the winds. Again, we have those conditions of electricity, which are expressed by the wonderful phenomena of magnetism, acting through and upon all parts of the globe, solid, fluid, and aerial; and brought before us under a new aspect by Professor Faraday's discovery of the magnetic properties of oxygen as modified by heat. Even that other subtle element of Light—if indeed it be another and separate element—may in some sort affect the atmosphere, through which its action is transmitted to the earth and ocean below. As associated with, or, according to a recent philosophy, *converted into* heat, there can be no doubt of this influence. But the marvellous results which science has obtained from the chemical action of light, in the various forms of Photography, justify the belief that other analogous effects may exist, though yet hidden from human observation. If electric states of atmosphere can convert oxygen into Ozone, light, in its different degrees of intensity, cannot well be supposed without influence, even on the inorganic parts of the aerial medium through which its passage lies. We know well its wonderful power in evoking the organic life, with the germs of which the atmosphere everywhere teems; and there is even reason to believe that this influence extends to different depths of sea, concurring with other causes to define those successive *strata* of animal and vegetable life which are so curiously attested as the result of the marine dredgings and soundings directed to this object.*

We deviate thus far from our direct subject, merely to point out the singular complexity of these elements and relations, which make up the history of atmospheric phenomena, whether on ocean or land. Such, and so close, are these relations, that scarcely a change can occur in any one of them, without altering or disturbing, more or less, the balance of all. Science is seeking to disentangle these elements of action; and to obtain both more exact results, and knowledge of the relative agency of each in producing them. But longer time and wider averages are required to this end; and meanwhile what we must regard as needful is patient and precise observation on all parts of the globe, and in all climes and seasons; aided by such an amount

* We cannot touch upon this latter point, without a passing tribute to the memory of the late Professor E. Forbes; a man whose genius and eminent powers of observation had already placed him in the foremost rank of the natural philosophers of his time; and who, had his life happily been prolonged, would undoubtedly have added further to his own scientific fame and to that of his country.

of *provisional* theory as may serve to the guidance of research, and to bind facts together, until they can be submitted to the governance of general laws.

These considerations may mitigate, though not wholly suppress, a criticism to which Lieut. Maury's work is liable here, and perhaps more or less throughout. He theorizes too largely and hazardingly, and does not clearly separate the *known* from the *unknown*. His volume is replete with valuable and ingenious suggestions; but they are not methodised enough for the uses of the common reader, who will probably rise from the chapters on winds and atmospheric currents, his head confused by a whirl of facts and theories and questions, as fleeting as the very air of which he has been reading. It must be admitted, indeed, that this subject of the winds of the ocean—whether permanent, periodical, or variable—is one of very difficult and intricate kind. The differences of temperature between the tropical and arctic regions, and the influence of the earth's diurnal rotation upon the currents of air thus produced, afford us a rational theory of the trade-winds. The periodical monsoons of the Indian Ocean, though depending in part on the same causes, yet are singularly modified by the proximity of great continents, islands, and mountain ranges; and though well known to practical navigation, their character is less certain, and their interpretation more obscure. Still slighter is our knowledge of the variable winds in those narrower seas of the globe, where the influences of the land become predominant over those of the ocean; phenomena in which we have great practical concern, but to which it is at present impossible to give any systematic form. It must further be kept in mind that our direct knowledge of the winds is derived from the lower strata of the atmosphere only. The aspects of clouds often show to the eye different or opposite currents at different heights: observations in balloons testify the same thing. Beyond this our conclusions are simply inferential, but resting on reasons so explicit that we cannot hesitate in believing the upper regions of the atmosphere to be traversed by currents of lesser density, but as determinate in space, time, and direction as the winds which sweep periodically over the surface below. The general equilibrium we find to be ever maintained; and this can only be effected by circuits and counter currents at different heights, according to the differences of temperature of each. The inference here approaches to a demonstration of the fact, though not reaching it by actual observation.

We cannot speak with the same assurance of a speculation, which, however, is sanctioned by eminent names, viz. that the more sudden and violent gales of wind, the tornadoes and

whirlwinds of the seas, are due to the upper currents of air bursting abruptly into those of lower level; and by their different direction of movement, different temperature, and possibly difference of electrical state, begetting the various phenomena of storm on the ocean beneath. No better theory has yet been proposed for these hurricanes; and in default of such, we must admit it as one of the many meteorological questions open to future research.

We should abuse the patience of our readers, were we to dwell longer on the subject of atmospheric currents, thus encircling the globe, and, under their various conditions, aiding or endangering the labours of man on the seas. The only remark we have further to add respecting Lieut. Maury's chapters on the atmosphere is, that he does not sufficiently allude to the influence of the variable weight of this great aerial ocean upon the ocean of waters below. Those who have attended to the phenomena and probable theory of the *Seiches* in the small basin of the Lake of Geneva, or witnessed the frequent and abrupt oscillations of a forty-feet water barometer, will be able to appreciate this element of unequal atmospheric pressure, as applied to the great watery surface of the globe. Nor do we find any allusion by our author to the singular fact recorded by Sir James Ross, of the permanently low barometric pressure in high southern latitudes; or to the curious observation of Professor Airey and Mr. Birt, on the periodical rise of the barometer in the course of every month to some point above 30° , suggesting the notion of great atmospheric waves, ruffled by smaller waves in the intervals between. We must look to the future for a solution of these, and a thousand other difficulties in meteorology, which are beyond the reach of any tables or averages yet obtained. All such phenomena may be best studied under the equator, where there is little variation in the sun's meridian altitude; and where the zone of observation is symmetrically related to each hemisphere. The diurnal fluctuation of pressure is so regular there, that the time may generally be determined within 15 or 16 minutes by the barometer alone.

The 'Depths of the Ocean,' and the methods employed to determine them, form an interesting chapter in the volume before us. Until a very recent time these methods were so far imperfect that, though numerous soundings were made into the more profound depths which sailors call 'blue water,' it could seldom be affirmed 'that fathom line had truly touched the ground' in these abysses of the sea. In the Southern Atlantic, more especially, results were given as obtained by British and American officers, which indicated depths varying from 26,000 to

50,000 feet, or from 5 to 9½ miles; and in several of these instances without any assurance of the plummet having reached the bottom. Here, in fact, lay the uncertainty of the whole process. Under currents might intervene, turning aside a slender thread and insufficient weight from the right line of descent; or, if allowing the weight to touch the ground, still acting upon the bight of the line, so as to cause it to run out too far from the reel in the vessel above.

We owe a better system of soundings to the active ingenuity of our American brethren on the seas. It was first decided that the twine used for this purpose must be of stronger texture; so as to bear a weight of at least 60 pounds, freely suspended in the air. This sounding twine is divided by 100 fathom marks. The weight employed is a simple cannon ball of 32lbs. or 68lbs. weight, so appended, that on touching the ground, it is detached from the twine: leaving, however, to reascend with the latter an ingenious little apparatus, the contrivance of Mr. Brooks of the United States Navy, which gathers and brings up specimens from the bottom of these deep recesses. Experiments made with lines thus constructed, have furnished a scale of the average time of descent for different depths, exact enough to tell pretty nearly when the ball ceases to carry the line out, and when therefore the depth is truly determined.*

The result of these improved methods has hitherto been to indicate a lesser depth than was inferred from previous soundings. The greatest hitherto ascertained, is in the North Atlantic, on the southern edge of the Banks of Newfoundland, where the ball touched the ground, and parted from its line, at about 25,000 feet, or nearly five miles below the surface. Yet if Laplace's calculation of four miles as the mean ocean depth be correct, there must exist spaces with far deeper soundings than this; and such in truth, we may expect to find, when navigators apply their present resources to fathom those other vast oceans, where the line has rarely been sunk for the purposes of science only, and where the phenomena of coral isles, and volcanoes show conditions of deep subsidence as well as elevation, from physical action taking place in the interior of the globe. The time may come, but yet is far distant, when we shall be able to map this great submarine territory, with some approach to truth; and in so doing, perchance obtain a further insight into those wonderful

* Lieutenant Maury gives in Plate xi., annexed to his volume, a general delineation of the depths of the Atlantic; probably the best yet published, but derived from soundings which are partly liable to the doubts noticed above.

changes, paroxysmal or gradual, which the outer surface of the earth has undergone, in the course of ages, from central causes, hitherto reached by conjecture alone. Knowledge need never be despaired of from any source, however seemingly remote, where the connexion of the physical sciences is becoming so intimate in all its parts. A single instance may be given as peculiarly belonging to this Ocean of which we are treating. In a remarkable memoir by Prof. E. Forbes on the 'Connexion ' between the existing Floras and Faunas of the British Isles, ' and the Geological Changes which have affected this Area,' we find denoted, amongst other curious local relations of certain British species to those of the nearest opposite continents, the singular case of identity of several species in the South-west Irish Flora, with species found not nearer than the mountains forming the north coast of Spain. On various grounds Prof. Forbes concludes — and he was not a rash speculator in science — that the British Isles acquired this connexion of their Flora and Fauna with that of neighbouring lands, by immigration of species before the area they now occupy was severed from the greater continent. The specialty of the Irish case as to distance does not deter him from following out this conclusion. Boldly, but not without much show of reason, he draws a line of ancient continent across the Bay of Biscay and yet further westwards into the actual Atlantic. Geology tells us of numerous changes and alterations of land and sea, similar in kind, and still vaster in extent. Those changes which we may suppose to have visited Britain, though far removed from man's knowledge, are comparatively recent in the history of the earth — presumably of later date than what has been called the *Meiocene* epoch. It might seem as if a sort of specious reality were thus given to the ancient fable of the Atlantis: but no relation of time will serve us here, and the legend must be left in its old obscurity.

We cannot quit this topic of the depth of the Atlantic, without referring to one matter connected with it, far surpassing in grandeur any fable or imagination of antiquity — we mean the Atlantic Electric Telegraph, now in progress towards execution. The scheme, if not originating in a series of soundings across this ocean, has at least been matured and directed by them. These soundings, conducted chiefly by an American officer, Captain Berryman, have disclosed the existence, between Newfoundland and the western coast of Ireland, of a sort of plateau forming the bed of the sea, at a depth nowhere exceeding 2070 fathoms; and, what is of greater moment for its destination, having a very *uniform grade of descent* from each side

towards this point of greatest depression, which is nearly equidistant from Valentia and St. John's, the assumed eastern and western termini of the submarine telegraph. The actual distance between these points is 1,900 statute miles; of which, about 1,500 miles intermediate between the dips from each side, and named by Lieut. Maury, the 'Telegraphic plateau,' afford a soft and singularly equable level; chiefly, it would seem, of calcareous rock, covered in great part with a layer of microscopic tropical shells, and well adapted in every way to receive the wonderful instrument of human intelligence which is about to be committed to this submarine bed. It has been surmised, and not without show of reason, that these very materials, forming the bottom of the plateau, may furnish a coating of natural concrete to the electric cable; adding to its stability of position, and lessening the chances of injury or destruction from the elements around; and possibly also affording a more perfect means of transmission of the electric action itself.

We cannot afford space, and it would be alien to our subject, to dilate on this extraordinary project; but in the subjoined note we give a few of the more important details, which will serve briefly to illustrate the *mechanism* of the undertaking, commercial as well as scientific.* These details may interest

* The capital destined to this enterprise is 350,000*l.*, divided into 350 shares of 1000*l.* each; 262 of which have been taken in England, 88 in America. The British Government, besides certain preliminary aids, guarantees 4 per cent. on the capital, *when, and as long as the telegraph is in working order*, in remuneration for all the work done on government behalf.

The submarine cable through which the electrical current will be conveyed (to use a conventional language which future knowledge may alter), is three fourths of an inch in diameter. The copper conducting wires pass through it, coated securely with gutta-percha; and this central portion of the cable is covered and protected by strands of iron-wire, eighteen in number, each of these composed of seven iron threads, loosely twisted together. The weight of the cable is about 2000 lbs., or somewhat less than a ton, to the mile. Though exceedingly flexible, it is capable of supporting six miles of its own length suspended vertically in water. The contract we understand to be for 2600 miles of this cable to be in readiness for use by the end of next May.

The submersion, according to present plans, is to be effected by two steamers, each conveying half the cable. These vessels, meeting at the middle point in the Atlantic, will first effect secure junction of the ends of the cable, and then separate—the one with a destination to Ireland, the other to Newfoundland—drawing the telegraph cable into the ocean, as they severally proceed in ex-

many of our readers; but higher interest is involved in the whole discovery and design of the Electric Telegraph, whether on earth or submarine, as the astonishing result of a new element of power subjected to human uses and human will. Let it be simply recollected that one hundred and fifty years ago, this electrical action or force—we are obliged to hesitate in calling it *matter*—was known to mankind only in its elementary aspects of attraction and repulsion; while now it is recognised in all the great phenomena, organic and inorganic, of the globe, and has become the most wonderful instrument of power in our hands, for action on all the various forms of matter around us. So utterly was this element hidden from all prior knowledge (for the thunder-storm still interpreted to the superstition of man, and not to his reason), that its present development has almost the character of a new creation. If modern science finds cause to be proud of what it has achieved in these great discoveries, there is ample reason for humility in the many questions which still remain unsolved; even such as lie at the very origin of the subject, and were matter of speculation and perplexity to its earliest cultivators. A crowd of facts, and numerous subordinate laws, have been attained; but some higher and more general law is yet wanting to govern and connect the whole. The object, however, is now well defined, and the first philosophers of our time are pressing eagerly along the paths which lead towards it.

We are a little puzzled how to rate the chances of the Atlantic Telegraph as a pecuniary speculation apart from the guarantee which Government has given to it. It has no antecedents having likeness enough to justify any bold promise or assertion. We are forced to ask, if a flaw should occur from any cause, present or future, in this long line of submarine chain,—if the price current of cotton put into motion as a message from America should fail to move the needle on the Liverpool side,—how is the faulty spot to be discovered, and how to be repaired? Every precaution, we know, has been taken which art or science could suggest, to guard against accident; but there are some elements concerned, such as the

—hanging frequent electric signals through it, to indicate their relative position as well as to attest the completeness of the work accomplished. It is estimated that the whole cable may be laid down in the ocean depths in eight days from the time when the junction of the two halves has been effected.

influence of time upon the instruments put into action, which it is not easy to submit to any calculation. Certain scientific difficulties also, connected with the theory of electric induction, and experimentally applied by Faraday to the case of wires conveyed by insulated submarine tubes, have suggested themselves as likely to retard, or otherwise impair, a current thus prolonged. The science, however, which is able to foresee these difficulties, is competent, we trust, to provide a remedy; and this question, as well as that of the best methods for 'rapid signalling' by the electric telegraph, has engaged the notice of Professor Thompson of Glasgow, than whom few men are better able to resolve it.

As to the practical results to the welfare of the world, and more especially of England and America, from the completion of this singular work, we are not altogether converted by the current phraseology of the day. It is easy to affirm that whatever gives fresh facilities to human communication is productive of good; and difficult, perhaps, to disprove the assertion. But in so stating the matter we must keep in mind that it is the *speed of intelligence* only which is here chiefly in question. Doubts may suggest themselves, whether the farthing-a-pound fluctuations in the price of cotton deserve a daily transmission across the Atlantic; especially as the same means may be used to tell almost simultaneously the same fact to every Liverpool broker, or Manchester manufacturer. The demand for any particular article of traffic, whether raw or manufactured, is rarely so sudden or impetuous, as not to be able to await transmission by the next steamer. A criminal fugitive may be arrested at the moment of landing, by his description outrunning him on the ocean; but the tidings of friendship or family affection will not trust themselves to be interpreted by the vibrations of a needle, and the translations of a hired pen. Even in the more serious matters of diplomacy, we may indulge a doubt whether the old-fashioned pauses in intercourse were not as salutary as the instant communications of our own days; giving more time for passions to subside, and for first opinions to soften by reflection; and preserving to the diplomatist a responsibility, equally essential to his own honour and to the interests of the country he represents. We are aware, however, that there is a double face to all these points; and without pressing further any such ambiguous presages, we shall be ready and eager to join in the general gratulation on the success of an undertaking thus wonderful as an effort of human genius and power; and destined, we trust, to link together still more closely in amity as well as

intercourse, the two great nations already having kindred in origin, language, and common liberties.*

We have occupied so much space with these various topics, that our notice of the other parts of Lieut. Maury's volume must be a very limited one. In a chapter on the 'Salts of the Sea,' he propounds his views, and perhaps with some exaggeration, as to their influence in creating ocean currents by the different specific gravity of strata of water differently charged with salt. To the curious question regarding the origin of this saline matter, amounting to three and a half per cent. in the average of all seas, he answers that it was thus when the ocean was created; that no washing down of salts by rivers can adequately explain the phenomenon; and that the 'Christian man of science' may rest on the absence of any proof from Scripture or otherwise, that the sea waters were ever fresh. Even accepting the conclusion as probable, we must repeat our remonstrance against this mode of stating it. The question in itself is one of much difficulty, and we can see no evidence that it is ever likely to go beyond presumption. The uniformity in the quantity, quality, and proportion of the saline constituents, and the fossil animal remains of ancient *Salt seas*, now found many thousand feet above the ocean surface, would seem the strongest proofs of identity of state from the beginning. The presence in all sea-water, though in most minute proportion, of those singular elements (or what are provisionally called such) Iodine and Bromine, becomes a special part of this argument, and cannot be neglected. We do not yet venture to cite to the same effect the recent discovery of silver, as another ingredient; since further experiments are needed to attest its universality:† But all these researches

* Some tokens of jealousy are perceptible in the American newspapers, as well as in the Senate, at the fact of the termini of the Atlantic Telegraph being both in British territory. Without adverting to the very obvious physical reasons for this arrangement, we may express our belief, as well as hope, that it will never become a matter of political importance. We perceive that Lieut. Maury has recently published his opinion that any direct line to the United States would be impracticable, from the much greater depth of ocean, and from the prolongation of the cable to 3000 miles, a length probably beyond the power of transmission of a single electrical current.

† The discovery of silver in sea-water by Malaguti and Durocher, is curiously confirmed by certain experiments of Mr. Field, showing the presence of silver, even to the amount of seven ounces to the ton, in the copper sheathing of ships long exposed to sea-water. These observations are related in a paper read to the Royal Society some months ago.

We may notice here the curious experiments of Professor Chap-

show the complex and wonderful nature of that ocean-fluid, which wraps round so large a part of the solid globe.

In treating of the various ocean temperature, and its influence in producing currents, we do not observe any notice of that singular and important discovery which we owe to Sir James Ross; viz., the existence of a stratum of *invariable temperature*, $39\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ Fahrenheit, pervading the ocean from north to south, and represented on each side the equator by a similar and very curious curve, depending on the superficial heat or cold in different latitudes. At the equator the depth of this level of constant temperature is 7,200 feet — in latitude 56° it is at the surface—in the Arctic regions it descends again to 4,500 feet; the temperature in each case being invariably the same, that is $39\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$, below the level of these several depths. The value of such observations to every theory of submarine currents will readily be perceived.

In a chapter on 'Ocean Routes,' Lieut. Maury gives some graphic narratives of that racing on the high seas, which, if it be the pride and profit of modern navigation, is also oftentimes to be accounted its folly and peril. The struggle for superiority, whether by sail or steam, is still almost exclusively between England and the posterity of England in America—the two great commercial communities of the world. Though the Indian and Pacific Oceans form part of the scene of contest, the Atlantic is the arena where science and skill, aided by abundant capital, and incited by emulation, have achieved results, which half or even a quarter of a century ago would have been deemed impossible. These results are too well known to need relation here; but we may notice briefly one or two facts, illustrating and explaining the wonderful changes now in progress in commercial navigation. We should scarcely err in stating the average duration of long ocean voyages — as those to or from China, Australia and India, performed by the best sailing ships — at barely half what it was at the first period just named. Among the causes concerned in this great result must first be noted, the improved construction and fitting of ships, and more especially in regard to what Mr. Russell has called the *wave principle of construction*; or, in other words, the form of

man of Toronto, as to the comparative rate of evaporation from salt and fresh water. They show that the greater the proportion of salt, the slower the evaporation; and that water containing the same percentage as that of the sea, loses, in 24 hours, not quite half as much as fresh water. This fact gives some support to Mr. Chapman's theory, that one great use of the salt in the ocean is that of regulating and controlling the evaporation ever going on over its vast surface.

least resistance of a solid moving through water. Connected with this, and in practice now applied to the same end, is the direct relation ascertained to exist between the length of the vessel and the speed it is capable of attaining. But beyond these altered conditions of the vessel itself, comes in the enlarged and more exact knowledge of the seas it traverses; of the winds and currents, the shoals and depths, and the various other physical phenomena of the ocean, which have been brought to the aid of practical navigation, and to which we have already so copiously referred. To the combination of these causes, and the record of the tracks and times of many hundred voyages, upon methods which Lieut. Maury has done much to enforce, we owe those feats of seamanship which have brought Australia within ten weeks of England, and made the circumnavigation of the globe as frequent and familiar as was once the passage across the Atlantic.

We have here been speaking of sailing vessels:—Steam navigation has its own peculiar history, including not only these several improvements, but others also, which depend on more perfect machinery and a higher class of engineers. Though steam has now spread its dominion over the globe, the Atlantic is still the sea where it puts forth its greatest powers. The several lines of Mail Steamers across this Ocean, and more especially those familiarly known as the Cunard and Collins lines, have reached a degree of speed and regularity, which it would be hazardous to say may not hereafter be surpassed, but which will ever be a monument and mark of human progress, in applying the physical elements to the uses and demands of man. It is no serious disparagement to the second of these lines, to say that it has lost the superiority for a short time gained in speed over the Cunard line of English steamers. According to an American statement now before us, we find that, during the last year, the average of twenty-five passages from Liverpool to New York, by the American steamers, was 12 days 16½ hours—by the English steamers, 11 days 22 hours: of passages from New York to Liverpool, by the American vessels, 12 days 8 hours,—by the English, 11 days 3 hours. Many circumstances concur to this result; chiefly, perhaps, the consummate discipline of the English vessels in their every department of service. But the rivalry we regard as an honourable one, and it may yet be maintained, advantageously to the interest of both nations.

It is not, however, a rivalry without risk. In seeking for the maximum of speed, safety is jeopardized in all these great lines of mail steamers. Winter storms, icebergs, fogs, tropical hurricanes, and collisions with other vessels, are all encountered at

high rates of velocity. Experience and discipline have done much to protect against these dangers, but serious hazards still exist; and especially those of collision, which are constantly augmenting in an ocean every year more crowded with ships, seeking to find the shortest passage across it. In these days, however, of bold design and prompt execution, there are few ills which do not bring with them the suggestion of remedy. Lieut. Maury, and others in sequel to him, have urged the adoption of '*steam lanes*' across the Atlantic; that is, definite lines of navigation of a certain width, and distinct from others throughout; so appropriated severally to vessels going east or west, that the chances of collision may be greatly lessened, if not actually removed. The width of the zone of ocean now traversed by the mail steamers is about 250 miles. It is proposed to mark off *lanes*, 20 or 25 miles in width, on the northern and southern borders of this zone, as the routes respectively to be followed and adhered to, by all steam vessels crossing in one direction or the other. The scheme, or some one equivalent to it, we doubt not to be practicable; and such is its obvious utility, that we as little doubt its being eventually carried into effect. The phrase of a *Steam lane* may somewhat startle those who are wont to associate with this word the cross roads of a midland rural district—the high hedges, deep ditches, and straggling cart ruts; the bushes of blackberry, hazel-nut and hawthorn, and the hundred sweet flowers and weeds which luxuriate on the hedge banks. We cannot quarrel, however, with this new use of the term, if the object be fulfilled to which it is applied;—if *long lanes* of ocean, 'which have no turning,' be really laid out for the safer navigation of the seas. The very simplicity and familiarity of the name is a tribute to that prowess of man, which has taught him thus to mark out and pursue a fixed path through the wide wilderness of waters.

Though not having exhausted the subject of the Atlantic, either in its physical features, or in its relations to human industry and power, we stop here, only to refer our readers to Lieut. Maury's own observations on these subjects. The points we have touched upon will show how copious and interesting a topic, under both these aspects, is the '*Physical Geography of the Sea*;' and how worthy to be embodied with the other great natural sciences, which at this time enlighten and animate the world. Every year enlarges its domain; and we may fairly predict that the history of the Atlantic, written twenty years hence, will be a record of numerous physical facts, now either wholly unknown, or dimly and doubtfully understood.

ART. IV. — *The Life and Correspondence of Major-General Sir John Malcolm, G. C. B., late Envoy to Persia and Governor of Bombay, from unpublished Letters and Journals.* By JOHN WILLIAM KAYE. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1856.

THE traveller who descends into Eskdale from that bleak range of hills, in which several of the classic streams of the Scottish Lowlands take their source, sees, as the fertile and wooded valley opens before him, a column or monument raised on Langholm Hill to the memory of one whose fame is connected with the remotest parts of the British Empire, but who drew breath on this spot, and who never ceased, through the vicissitudes and the triumphs of an active and successful career, to turn with the affection of youth to Burnfoot of Esk. The name of Sir John Malcolm, and of that gallant band of brothers who, like him, were reared among the burns and braes of this border glen, is fitly commemorated by this trophy of their achievements. ‘Confidentially employed in the East from his youth,’ to borrow the language of the inscription on that obelisk, ‘in the highest political and military affairs, by the indefatigable exertion of those extraordinary mental and physical powers with which Providence had endowed him, he became alike distinguished in the arts of war and of government, in letters and in arms.’ The narrative of his life, and of the energetic efforts for the service of his country and of India which marked every part of it, is a conspicuous and encouraging example to those who, like him, may be the architects of their own fortunes in the service of this great empire; and the public are indebted to Mr. Kaye for a contribution to our biographical literature which is not only a pleasing and instructive record of Sir John Malcolm’s career, but which portrays the growth of a manly and self-relying character, and throws some additional light on the history of British policy in India.

This book deserves to participate in the popularity which it was the good fortune of Sir John Malcolm to enjoy to a very remarkable extent in his lifetime. No man ever united political talents, lofty enterprise, and an indomitable perseverance in the transaction of business, with a more buoyant, fresh, and amiable disposition. His affectionate regard for all who were connected with him by the ties of blood or of friendship was neither chilled by the gifts of fortune, nor repressed by the cares of active life. Burnfoot and Eskdale were ever associated with the passionate tenderness of his home affections. As Warren Hastings had

longed to regain the possession of Daylesford amidst the cares and contests of the government of Bengal; as Munro forgot the earnest duties of his sober and severe life when he thought of his father's tulip beds and his mother's myrtles; Malcolm, from the earliest days of his military boyhood till the time when he sat as Governor of Bombay, never ceased to long for what he called another '*paddle in the burn*.' In all his dealings he was governed by the nicest sense of honour, and such was his open-handed liberality, that he not unfrequently alarmed the authorities in Leadenhall Street by his munificence: yet though he had filled a variety of high offices in India, at a time when Indian servants were supposed to be enriched by the treasures of Asia, his personal fortune remained modest, and, indeed, was barely equal to meet the generous impulses of his nature. His lofty physical stature, his cheerful manly countenance, his commanding presence, his power of supporting immense fatigue, his excellent horsemanship which won the admiration of the Court of Persia, his love of field sports, especially of those in which courage must be combined with skill, and his eager participation in every incident or amusement of the hour, gave a chivalrous and sometimes romantic air to a man who had learned, from early experience and natural elasticity of character, to play his part with grace in all the scenes of life. It was his peculiar good fortune to win, almost at the outset of his career in India, the friendship and confidence of the two illustrious brothers—Marquis Wellesley and the Duke of Wellington, who left the stamp of their genius not less indelibly impressed on the government of Asia than on the subsequent destinies of Europe. Educated in that great school of statesmen and of soldiers, he retained through life their good opinion; and amongst the valuable unpublished documents which Mr. Kaye has extracted from the Malcolm papers, the correspondence of Lord Wellesley and the Duke forms the most remarkable and valuable feature. At the dinner given to Malcolm by the East India Company, in 1827, before he started to assume the government of Bombay, the Duke of Wellington said, in the presence of Mr. Canning, then Prime Minister of England:—

“A nomination such as this,” said the Duke of Wellington, “operates throughout the whole Indian service. The youngest cadet sees in it an example he may imitate—a success he may attain. The good which the country derives from the excitement of such feelings is incalculable. It is now thirty years since I formed an intimate friendship with Sir John Malcolm; during that eventful period, there has been no operation of consequence, no diplomatic measure,

in which my friend has not borne a conspicuous part. Alike distinguished by courage and by talent, the history of his life, during that period, would be the history of the glory of his country in India." And with these words still ringing in his ears, Malcolm soon afterwards took his departure.' (Vol. ii. p. 491.)

But whilst Sir John Malcolm had earned the applause of the powerful and the respect of the great, he was not less esteemed and beloved by the humblest of those who had ever lived under his authority or become the objects of his care. His intimate knowledge of the native districts of India had been, from the very commencement of his career, one of the most important elements of his success; he was barely two and twenty when he served as interpreter to the Nizami's detachment under Lord Cornwallis; and the same accomplishments which had thus early qualified him for a staff appointment gave him a peculiar insight into the character of the people of India. They repaid him with a degree of sympathy which the British rulers of that vast population have not always excited in their breasts. Mr. Kaye says without exaggeration,

'In Malwah he was as a patriarchal ruler among them—the father and the friend of rude but grateful communities, who blessed the name of Malcolm as that of a tutelar saint. There could be no higher object of ambition. "I am busy with my report," he wrote on the 3rd of April, from Naleha, thirty miles to the westward of Mhow, "and with all kinds of improvements. I have fixed my head-quarters in an old palace, from which I expelled (I speak a literal fact) tigers. The old ruins of this place, and the celebrated city of Mandoo, have for more than a century been shared by tigers, and Bheels more destructive than these animals in their ravages. The tigers I shoot; the Bheels are my friends, and now serve in a corps I have raised, or cultivate lands. I have made, and am making, roads in every direction. A great fair at a holy place, which has not been visited for seventy years, was a week ago crowded by at least 30,000 people. I gave guards at the place, and cleared the road; and I confess that I was a little sensible to the flattery of the poor creatures making the air ring with 'Jy Malcolm jy!' (success to Malcolm), &c. &c. This, and the discovery, a few days ago, that among the Bheel ladies, tying a string upon the right arm of their children, whilst the priest pronounced the name of *Malcolm* three times, was a sovereign cure for a fever, are proofs at least of my having a good name among these wild mountaineers, which will do me as much and more good than one in Leadenhall Street." I am told that Bishop Heber used to relate how, when travelling in Central India, he inquired what was written on an amulet worn by a native child, and was told that it was nothing more than the word "*Malcolm*," which was considered, in that part of the country, the most efficacious of charms.' (Vol. ii. p. 317.)

Although the best years of his life were spent in the enervating climate of India, and he did not escape the common penalties of disease, aggravated by frequent and distant journies and by the accidents of war, Sir John Malcolm would deserve to be cited in any country as one of the most industrious of mankind. His literary productions alone are by no means inconsiderable. His massive History of Persia in two magnificent quartos is, and will probably remain, the principal authority in the language on that subject. His Memoir of Lord Clive has been effaced by the brilliant Essay of Mr. Macaulay, and his Political Sketches of the History of India and of the Sikhs have less claim to permanent fame. But in addition to these works, and to the onerous official correspondence of an Indian public servant, his pen seems never to have been at rest; letters to his family, poems, journals, elaborate memoranda on all subjects, and constant intercourse with a most extensive acquaintance, filled every hour of his existence; and the result is, that an extraordinary accumulation of his papers is still in existence from which Mr. Kaye has selected, perhaps with too much profusion, the materials of these volumes.

But in spite of these indisputable qualities, all of an amiable, and some of a high order, we cannot altogether concur in the enthusiastic conclusion of Sir John's biographer, that 'Nature made him for a hero,'—or at least, if he was intended for a hero, some essential ingredient was wanting in the composition. Although this life has been written in anything but a critical spirit, and it bears throughout marks of an extreme predilection for the subject of the narrative, the papers of Sir John Malcolm himself, and the disappointments which marked the later stages of his career, sufficiently indicate that he had what the French term '*les défauts de ses qualités*'—the imperfections which spring up in the midst of greatness. His character was expansive rather than profound. In action he was eager to impetuosity, but not always safe: his grasp was quick, but not invariably firm. He wanted altogether that sobriety of language, that terse concentration of thought and expression, that severe and scrutinising judgment, that cautious exercise of power, which has marked the career of the greatest Anglo-Indian statesmen. If the first rank in that illustrious band belongs to the daring wisdom and imperial qualities of such rulers as Warren Hastings, Clive, and Wellesley; and the second place to the disinterested virtues and the consummate statesmanship of such governors as Munro, Metcalfe, Elphinstone, and Bentinck; we must be content to place Sir John Malcolm in the third rank of the eminent men

who have founded and consolidated the British Empire in India. No government had ever a more zealous and intelligent agent, no people a kinder master or one more anxious for the general welfare: but it is no discredit to the subject of this Memoir to say that he stands at some distance below the greatest of the statesmen and soldiers who have ruled in the three Presidencies. Sir John Malcolm himself was less conscious of this truth than he might have been upon a more correct and dispassionate survey of his own powers, and his biographer seems disposed to judge him by the very high standard at which he rated his own merits. In a letter to one of his brothers, written in 1826, he observes that, 'I already feel the truth of Bacon's observation, that "a man who has been accustomed to go forward and findeth a stop, falleth out of humour with himself, and is not the thing he was."' And shortly afterwards he stated to the Duke of Wellington, in speaking of the Governor-generalship of India,—

'I thought Lord Amherst might have remained two years more, and I had a day-dream that I should by that time have been so deeply engaged in carrying into execution measures calculated to benefit the empire, that it was possible the desire for their completion, added to the short period of the charter, might have led to my being nominated Governor-general—an object to which my ambition has ever pointed, notwithstanding the almost insurmountable obstacle that appeared to intervene between me and its accomplishment.' (Vol. ii. p. 479.)

The Duke's reply to his old friend was brief but significant:—

'My dear Malcolm,—You do me justice in believing that I can have no prejudice against employing a servant of the Company as Governor-general in India. But I confess I doubt your attaining that object.'

The truth is, that with much that was excellent in his disposition, and admirable in his talents, Sir John Malcolm wanted that comprehensive power which is inseparable from true greatness. The men we have named were illustrious in every capacity. Metcalfe carried with him to Jamaica and Canada the same commanding abilities he had displayed in India. But Malcolm, once removed from the scene of his real utility, sank to a subordinate rank. His appearance in the House of Commons, in 1831, as a bigoted Tory and a champion and representative of the rotten boroughs the Reform Bill was then about to disfranchise, was unfortunate; and his defence of those boroughs as the means by which representatives might be given to India, singularly absurd. The extent to which these opinions were carried at that time by far greater men than Sir John

may be learned from the following extraordinary letter of the Duke of Wellington: —

‘THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON TO SIR JOHN MALCOLM.

‘Strathfieldsaye, Nov. 20. 1832.

‘My dear Malcolm, — I have received your note of the 19th. I heard from your brother the Admiral, whom I saw at Walmer Castle, that you were about to publish something upon India. I don't doubt but that what you will publish will be very creditable to you; but I confess that I don't expect that your writings, or those of an angel from heaven, if they contained truth and reasoning founded upon experience and common sense, would have any effect upon the conduct of the Government and the Legislature in these times.

‘A great effort is making here and everywhere to give the Reform Bill a fair chance of working not injuriously to the country. I think that we are all right to make the effort to have the best returns that we can have under the new system. But I am quite of opinion *with you, Croker, and others*, who think it is all in vain. There is no authority — there can be ~~no~~ authority — in this country capable of governing it, and of securing those institutions and interests which are the pillars of its prosperity and strength.

‘We have an executive and two chambers, according to the constitution of the year '3 (I believe), as the French, the Cisalpine, the Lygurian, the Mexican, the Colombian Republic had, and as France, the Netherlands, and others, had and have. But is there any government anywhere but the sword? There existed in this country peculiarly a secret in constitution and legislation not unlike the golden egg laid daily by the goose. We have wisely destroyed the goose. We have made a reform which satisfies nobody. The parties in the country are just ~~as~~ violent as ever. The Tories, now called Conservatives, wish to keep things as they now are. The Radicals and Whigs to do something more. In the mean time I defy an angel from heaven to settle Ireland, the West Indies, Mauritius, the Question of the Company's Charter, the Bank Question, the Tithe Question in Ireland and in England — I say nothing of foreign politics. We are, in every sense, “*Toto divisos ab orbe Britannos*.” I hope it may continue so. We have it not in our power, under existing circumstances, to do anything but mischief. I am sick at heart! I declare that I could at times gnaw the flesh from my bones with vexation and despair!

‘Believe me, ever yours most sincerely,
‘WELLINGTON.’*

To the generation of men who have already grown up to manhood since the passing of the Reform Bill, and to whom that measure is only known by its beneficent results, such

* Vol. ii. p. 588–89.

language may well appear strange. The very measures which the Duke of Wellington 'defied an angel from heaven to 'settle,' in 1832, are those which the temperate policy and the persevering exertions of the Liberal party had peacefully and successfully settled before ten years had elapsed. It is some excuse for men like Sir John Malcolm, who had been trained in the school of Asiatic administration, that opinions like these were entertained by men of so much greater eminence than himself, whose lives had been spent in the invigorating contests of a free country. But the bent of his mind to extreme Toryism was equally manifested in questions of purely Indian policy. He was strongly opposed to those measures of Lord William Bentinck which gave freedom to the Press, and which have since tended to raise the character of the natives of India above the degraded level of a conquered people; and although within the range of his own views of authority no man was more ready to devote himself to the public service, we look in vain through this record of his actions and his thoughts, for a more extended conception of the policy on which the future government of India was to rest.*

Although, therefore, we find much that is agreeable in Sir John Malcolm's character, we feel bound to demur to the claims put forward on his behalf in these volumes. Indeed, the biography itself inevitably partakes of the foibles of the subject of it. It is diffuse and redundant in many of the details of private life, and we should sometimes be glad to blow away the froth to reach a more invigorating liquor. Sir John Malcolm had the happiness to retain through life the vivacity of a schoolboy, but we have not met with any specimen of genuine wit in his correspondence. He was easily amused, which may have rendered

* Take for example the following specimens of Sir J. Malcolm's opinion on one or two points of present interest:—

'The present constitution of the Indian Government in England has many defects, but it has great and substantial advantages. The Directors, without the power of doing mischief, can prevent it. Their general ignorance (there are a few distinguished exceptions) of the affairs of India does good.'

'The Native Governments are abused as intolerably bad; why even in this view, the very contrast of their government with ours is strength. If we can contrive to keep up a number of native states without political power, *but as royal instruments*, we shall, I believe, exist in India as long as we maintain our naval superiority in Europe; beyond this date it is impossible.'

Such views as these already appear to us scarcely less out of date than those of the Duke of Wellington on the Reform Bill.

him amusing; but his own opinion of his powers was obviously higher than the opinion entertained of him by other people. He himself seems to have felt in his later years some twinges of disappointment, for he never attained the highest objects of his ambition; and in spite of these two portly octavos, we believe that his most enduring monument will be the obelisk on Langholm Hill.

We are, however, impatient to turn from these passages, which betray some of the deficiencies of Sir John Malcolm's character, to those incidents of his early life in which he put forth all his spirit, intrepidity, and resource. In these days of competitive examinations, when hardly a Company's servant sets his foot on the shore of India without a prize medal round his neck and a diploma in his pocket, we may look back with surprise at the race of men who won the empire this present generation has to govern. Jock Malcolm was just a Scottish scapegrace, caught at twelve years old on the brae side; inheriting the honourable principles of his father and the high gifts of his mother, but with no more book learning than he could pick up at the parish school of Westerkirk. But as Mr. Kaye well observes, these boys in early childhood, swimming in the flooded waters of the river, or scampering about the country on rough ponies, learnt lessons of independence, which were of service to them to the end of their lives. When the day came for Jock to return to London with his maternal uncle, and, as it proved, to enter upon life, his old nurse said to him, as she combed his hair, 'Noo, Jock, my mon, be sure when ye 'are awa', ye kaim your head and keep your face clean; if ye 'dinna, ye'll jest be sent hame agen.' 'Tut, woman,' was the answer, 'ye're aye sae feared; ye'll see if I were awa' amang 'strangers I'll jest do weel enough.' In that spirit, how many a Scottish lad has gone forth from his native hills to serve his country and to advance his fortunes! What an incalculable debt does this empire, in all its wide dependencies, owe to those manly hearts which recoiled before no difficulty and knew no fear! And if hundreds of them have risen to fame, and honour, and wealth, in the discharge of their duty, how many thousands of equal gallantry and talent have perished ere they gained their reward!

Thus it was that 'Boy Malcolm,' as he was long called in the army, left Burnfoot of Eskdale; his first commission was dated in October 1781, when he was just twelve years old, and in April 1783, when he was barely fourteen, he joined his regiment at Vellore. On the events of the next eight years of his life it is needless to dwell. They were years of apprenticeship to the service of the army, to the manners and

language of India, and, more than all the rest, to the realities of life. After a considerable amount of folly and extravagance, and a prolonged service of six years as an ensign, he gained his appointment on the staff under Marquis Cornwallis, before Seringapatam in 1792, by his knowledge of Persian; but his education must still have been very imperfect; and it was probably one of the most fortunate occurrences in his life, that his health soon afterwards compelled him to return to England, where he was able to improve those literary talents which formed no inconsiderable element of his subsequent success. From an early age he appears to have possessed an extraordinary facility in composition; his memory was singularly retentive; and he evidently acquired, or possibly imitated, something of the redundant phraseology and Johnsonian periods which were the fashion of the day. It is amusing to read the sentiments of a major in the Madras army, conveyed to Lord Wellesley in 1803, in terms which have all the grandiloquence of Dr. Parr.

‘MAJOR MALCOLM TO LORD WELLESLEY.

‘United Kingdom, at Sea, Feb. 9. 1803.

‘My Lord,—Before I left Calcutta I attempted personally to express to your Excellency the feelings of my heart; but I had not the power; and if I were to endeavour to state them in a letter I should be equally unsuccessful. Acknowledgments of obligations and professions of gratitude—the current payment of common favours—shall never be offered to your Lordship in discharge of a debt so serious as mine. An unshaken adherence to the principles of honour—a firm and onward tread in the path of virtue, and an unwearied exertion of talents which your Lordship’s approbation has persuaded me are not contemptible, will, I trust, combine to guide me in a course of action which shall convince your Lordship I have not thrown away the extraordinary advantages I have enjoyed, in holding so long a confidential station near your Excellency’s person; and I entertain the proud hope that no one action of my life (to whatever period it may please Providence to extend that blessing) shall ever give your Lordship cause to regret the partial kindness with which I have been treated, or the marks of honourable favour with which I have been distinguished.

‘Among the various feelings which at this moment occupy my breast, I recognise with exultation that of a personal attachment to your Lordship to be predominant; and I shall glory in every opportunity I may have of showing the nature of the zeal which that attachment inspires, and how far it places me above the common motives which influence men who are busy in the self-interested pursuit of fortune.

‘I have the honour to be, &c. &c.,

‘J. MALCOLM.’*

In his later writings he threw off this elaborate formality, but his style, though fluent, never became simple or idiomatical, and its defects were probably aggravated by the habitual diffuseness of Indian correspondence. No class of British public servants have written so much as the servants of the East India Company. With them, the pen serves the ordinary purposes of discussion and debate, and scarcely an incident has occurred in the government of India for the last seventy years, the reasons, motives, and consequences of which are not elaborately recorded in the archives of Leadenhall Street. But this excess of composition has scarcely ever produced a powerful writer. We cannot recall an instance of a regularly trained Indian statesman, whose style is not enervated by the verbiage of his profession; and it is an unspeakable relief in the volumes before us, to turn from the interminable volubility of Sir John Malcolm, to the nervous and masterly periods in which a man like Lord Wellesley recorded his intentions and his will.

Malcolm returned from England to India in 1796, about two years before Lord Wellesley assumed the reins of government; that event opened a larger field to his ambition, and extended the whole sphere of Indian politics. Indeed, there is no period in the eventful annals of our Indian Empire at all comparable in importance or in grandeur to those memorable years during which Lord Wellesley presided over its destinies. The generation has not yet altogether passed away which witnessed those extraordinary achievements; yet so deeply rooted are the results of Lord Wellesley's policy at the present day, that they appear to belong to a conquest as remote and secure as the triumph of the Normans over the Saxons, or of the Tartars over the Chinese. The government of Warren Hastings had established the supremacy of British interests in Bengal; the gallantry and the wisdom of Clive had founded another empire in the Deccan, kept in check the rival enterprise of France, and secured in Fort St. George at Madras the second seat of British power. But Lord Wellesley was the first Governor-general of India who conceived in its full extent the greatness of the Anglo-Indian Empire. To his powerful and daring mind it seemed, as he touched the shores of Hindostan, and perhaps even before he reached them, that not one hour was to be lost in expelling from India the foreign influences which divided it against us, — in crushing successively the native powers which might be formidable to our security, — and in extending the direct authority of the East India Company without a rival over the land. Before 1798, the relations of the Company

with all the native states were more or less unsettled, and one reverse of the British arms would have raised all India against us. When Lord Wellesley landed in India, the province or Presidency of Bengal extended from the mouths of the Ganges to Allahabad, and barely included a portion of the Doab of the Jumna. To the west, all Bundelcund, Malwa, and Gujerat were in the hands of the princes and chiefs of the Mahratta confederacy. Delhi was held by Scindiah, and the strong places of Bhurtpoor and Gwalior were untaken. The territories of the Peishwa, also a member of the Mahratta league, stretched between Bombay and the nearest British settlement. Holkar commanded the course of the Nerbudda, and the Rajah of Berar possessed that fertile region extending to the eastern coast of India at Cuttack. M. Piron, the successor of De Boigne, one of the last of those brave and skilful French adventurers who had so long counterbalanced the extension of British influence over the native courts of India, though ill supported and worse rewarded by their own countrymen in Europe, still held a commanding position in the Mahratta empire at the head of an efficient and disciplined force; in fact his territorial dominion, as it was styled by Lord Wellesley, extended towards the left bank of the Indus, through the Punjaub, and comprehended Agra, Delhi, and the most vulnerable portion of the north-western frontier of Hindostan. The revenue of this district amounted to not less than 1,700,000*l.* sterling; and the authority of those who directed the affairs of Scindiah was increased by the possession of the person of the deposed Emperor of the Moguls. Beyond this region little was really known at that time of the state of affairs; but Zemaun Shah, the King of Cabul, had advanced in 1796 at the head of his army to Lahore, and Sir John Shore had seriously contemplated the probability of an invasion of India by the hardy and martial tribes of Afghanistan.* Indeed after Lord Wellesley's arrival the Dooraunee Prince distinctly threatened to make the attempt. Nor was the South of India more free from the intrigues and military forces of the enemies of England. The centre of the Deccan acknowledged, as it still acknowledges, the authority of the Nizam, who owes the preservation of his independence to the fidelity with which he

* See Sir John Shore's remarkable minute on the probable invasion of Zemam Shah in the Appendix E. to the Wellesley Despatches. Vol. i. p. 671. The aggregate force disposable at that time for the defence of Bengal, was 16,000 men, about forty guns, one European regiment of cavalry, and 1,300 native horsemen.

has adhered in all times of danger to engagements contracted nearly sixty years ago. But at that time even the Nizam's dominions were garrisoned by a powerful body of French Sepoys, who were not the least dangerous antagonists we had to encounter. To the south, the Presidency of Madras had already acquired an extent almost equal to that of Bengal. But this portion of our establishments in India was incessantly threatened by a bold, intelligent, restless, and vindictive prince, hating the very name of the English, eager to ally himself to the French both in Europe, in Egypt, and in India, and preferring the destruction of his kingdom to submission. Such was Tippoo Sultan of Mysore.

'It cannot be denied,' said Lord Wellesley, in the memorable despatch which vindicated to the Court of Directors the first triumphs of his administration, 'that during the months of June and September 1798, your interests were menaced by a combination of the most serious dangers. The anxiety and fears hitherto entertained with regard to the designs of Tippoo Sultaun, were now confirmed by a certain knowledge of his having actually proposed to the French projects of the most extensive hostility against your possessions in India. The alarm, as well as the danger, was considerably aggravated by the formidable preparations of the French in the Mediterranean, by the apparently desperate state of our alliances in the Deccan, by the peculiar situation of the Court of Hyderabad, subjected to the will of a powerful French army and French faction, by the menacing declarations and probable views of Zemaun Shah, by the dispersed and defective condition of the army of Fort St. George, and above all by the general persuasion, that an early attempt to assemble or to move that army would serve only as a provocation to the enemy to invade and desolate the Carnatic, without furnishing the means of repelling the invader.'

But scarcely four weeks had elapsed from the arrival of the Governor-general at Calcutta, after he had previously landed for a few days at Fort St. George, on his way from Europe, when his resolution was taken, and measures were already adopted to move the military resources of India against the Sultan of Mysore.

When only three years later, in January 1802, Lord Wellesley found himself compelled to assert his insulted authority by an appeal to the Prime Minister, and by tendering his resignation to the Court of Directors, the amazing work he had commenced by the fall of Seringapatam was already well nigh accomplished, and he could declare, with conscious pride,

that, 'To the exercise of those powers which the Court would now subvert, I attribute the fall of Tippoo Sultaun, the conquest and settlement of Mysore, the extinction of the French influence in the Deccan, the establishment of the British influence in that quarter on the solid foundations of military strength and territorial possession; the transfer of Tanjore, of Surat, of the Carnatic and of Oude to the British Government; the substitution of a powerful British force on the north-western frontier of Oude, in the place of the undisciplined, licentious, and disaffected army of the Nabob Vizier; the destruction of the power of Zemaun Shah; the foundation of an intimate alliance with Persia; the means of contributing to the maintenance of Egypt by the army of India; the tranquillity of the Mahrattas; and finally the seasonable occupation of the Portuguese possessions in the East Indies.'

These expressive lines include the results of the first three years of Lord Wellesley's government of India, but they embrace likewise most of the political principles by which that empire has been consolidated. We have lived in the generation which followed that great man and his worthy coadjutors to behold the total extinction of every independent military power which could threaten the peace of Hindostan; to see the last vestiges of foreign influence effaced when the armies of Runjeet Singh were overthrown on the Sutledge; to extend the frontiers of India to their furthest natural boundaries; to exercise an undisputed supremacy throughout those parts of Asia which have known our sway; and as the consequence of these successes we have been enabled to establish the blessings of order, law, government, and civilisation over territories which had been for ages oppressed by tyrants or harried by conquerors. On no other basis but that broad and comprehensive one which the genius of Lord Wellesley projected, could this stately edifice have been reared. The existence of British power in India for any salutary purpose was impossible if India was still to be the battle-field of the contending powers of Europe or of the more ferocious rivalry of the Mahommedan conquerors of Hindostan. The British Legislature had passed Acts to prohibit the extension of our dominions in the East; the Court of Directors received with sullen repugnance the tidings of victories which placed their representative on the throne of an Empire: but meanwhile the energy, the enterprise, the instinctive wisdom of the Indian government had surmounted obstacles which were still scarcely discovered in Europe, and the task that devolved on its successors was only to retain and to use for the public good the power thus placed in their hands. In many of these transactions

it was the good fortune of Sir John Malcolm to play a most active and useful part, and before the termination of his career, he was entitled to say, 'The large work has been done. India is subdued; the very minds of its inhabitants are for the moment conquered.'

In September 1798 the diplomatic career of Sir John Malcolm commenced, by his appointment to the assistant residentship at Hyderabad under Captain Kirkpatrick. Lord Wellesley expressly stated, in naming the young officer to this post, that he had been governed by no other motive than his knowledge of the zeal with which Malcolm had pursued the study of the native languages and the political system of India. The duties of the post were of the utmost importance, for they involved in the first instance the suppression of the French corps of nearly 14,000 men under Piron, which the Nizam still held in his pay. Kirkpatrick's negotiations had prepared the way for this important revolution. The Nizam's minister, Azim ool Omrah, was favourable to the substitution of a British contingent. Six battalions of British troops were already on their march towards Hyderabad from the side of Guntoor; and the affair was so skilfully conducted that, whilst the Durbar was convulsed by the struggle of the French and English parties, the French corps was surrounded in front and rear by two brigades of infantry, and a detachment of 1500 horse under Malcolm cut off their escape on the right flank. A mutiny broke out among the men. Piron and the French officers were seized by their own troops; and shortly afterwards the whole corps laid down their arms, and surrendered their stores and accoutrements to the British Residency, without firing a shot.

This exploit, in which Malcolm had shown judgment and resolution, served to establish his reputation at Government House, where he shortly afterwards laid the colours of the annihilated French corps at the feet of Lord Wellesley. Accordingly he accompanied the victorious expedition of 1799 against Mysore. Beneath the walls of Seringapatam he first met Arthur Wellesley on the scene of his earliest triumphs; and he was appointed, with Captain Thomas Munro, first secretary to the commission for the settlement of the Mysore Government, and the partition of the conquered territory.

Although the reduction of the power of Tippoo Saib, and the annihilation of the influence supposed to be acquired by the French in Southern India, were the first objects against which Lord Wellesley directed his policy and his arms, he appears to have been equally alive to the approach of danger on the north-western frontier; and this apprehension was increased

by the discovery, among the papers of the Court of Mysore, of direct proofs of Tippoo's intrigues with the French, and also with Zemaun Shah. Although we now look on these transactions with the experience derived from half a century of successful administration in India, and we believe the results of Lord Wellesley's policy to have contributed largely to these beneficial results, it cannot be denied that the motives which most forcibly operated on his mind, at that time, were widely remote from the legitimate objects of the Indian government.

The Governor-general of 1793 had left Europe in the fever of the revolutionary war. The horror of anarchy in France, and the ferocious aggressions of Jacobinism in Europe, had powerfully affected the mind of every British statesman. The military genius of Buonaparte had just begun to direct that spirit of aggression to which the Revolution had just given birth, and the expedition to Egypt was commonly regarded as a blow directed by France against the British power in India. 'Should this not be put a stop to,' said Mr. Udney in a letter to Lord Grenville of April 1798, 'the consequences may be fatal; for whether by the Gulf of Persia—by land from Egypt—or the Red Sea, troops may be got out now or at some future time, and by keeping possession of Alexandria, Cairo, and Suez, they might even on a peace, make alliances and occasion great disturbances in India.' Nor were these intentions entirely foreign to the mind of Buonaparte himself, until they were dissipated by the cannon of Aboukir and the resistance of St. Jean d'Acre.

Such was the intelligence regularly transmitted to India by Lord Grenville and Henry Dundas. It kindled the fiercest excitement in the little Court of Calcutta. Malcolm, with his usual impetuosity, imbibed the wildest Anti-Gallican ardour. He had himself found the awful words *liberté* and *Constitution* embroidered on the lapells of the French corps in the Deccan; and when he was selected, shortly after the Mysore War, to proceed to Persia in the capacity of Envoy Extraordinary, he perfectly understood that the object of his mission was, above all things, to oppose a barrier in that quarter to the aggressive policy of France. Before, however, the political treaty he was charged to negotiate could be concluded, intelligence was received at Teheran that the French had evacuated Egypt; and the rebellion of Prince Mahmood in Afghanistan had reduced the dreaded authority of Zemaun Shah to impotence.

Malcolm's personal success in this embassy was complete. His spirited bearing excited admiration, and his unbounded liberality almost satiated the cupidity of the Persian courtiers.

But Mr. Kaye confesses that, 'the specific advantages accruing ' from the mission it is not so easy to define,' except that the two contracting parties undertook to expel or extirpate the French if they ever attempted to occupy the islands and shores of Persia.

This mission, however, gave Malcolm a knowledge of Persia which few of his countrymen possessed. It induced him to collect the materials of his principal literary work, the History of the Persian Monarchy, and it gave authority to his opinions whenever the affairs of Persia came before the public. On these grounds we have already had occasion to refer in a recent article, on the causes of our late differences with the Court of Teheran, to Sir John Malcolm's views on this subject; but a more elaborate paper is now before us, which was drawn up by him when governor of Bombay in 1828, and in which the mutual relations of Persia, Russia, and British India are fully considered. The bearing of this paper on the present state of these questions induces us to borrow some passages from it, and we could hardly select a more favourable specimen of Malcolm's style of political writing. It is an ample and able justification of the very same measures of precaution which the British Government has lately had reason successfully to adopt:—

'Throughout the whole kingdom the name of an Englishman stands as high, if not higher, than it ever did; and the Mahometan population of the city of Tabreez, by assembling in their mosques and deputing their priests to express their thanks to the English Envoy, have mingled a religious feeling with their sentiments, which gave to this remarkable circumstance a character alike calculated to raise the individual whose conduct had called forth such a burst of gratitude, and to increase that influence and popularity which is, and must continue, our chief, if not our only strength in Persia. These impressions should be carefully cherished; for if preserved, they will be of more use in enabling us to defeat the enemies we may eventually have in that quarter of the world, than any number of troops we could ever detach to fight our battles in a remote and uncivilised country like Persia.

'It is a conviction of this fact that has led me to dwell at such length upon the value of the impressions produced by the British Mission. I say mission, for Lieut.-Colonel Mac Donald has been admirably supported by those under him, and to whose efforts he gave a tone and direction. *In a country like Persia, everything depends on the character and conduct of the individuals.* Ignorant or imperfectly informed of other nations, every inference is drawn, every conclusion made, from what is present belonging to the people and Government of whom they judge. This gives the greatest importance to the selection of persons to be employed in such countries.

'Had Lieut.-Colonel Mac Donald failed in his effort to arrest the advance of the Russians on Teheran, there can exist no doubt that

almost all the southern provinces of Persia, as well as the northern, would have fallen from their allegiance. Under such a state of affairs, Russian troops and Russian agency would have been spread over Irak and Fars, to the shores of the Gulf, and to the province of Khorassan. This must have been an inevitable result, and one beyond the power of the Russian Government to control; and it may be safely asserted that, however unsettled that empire's power over Persia might have been, the sensation produced by the mere fact of its advance would have been nearly ruinous to all our present plans of economy and retrenchment.

'When I express this opinion, I must declare an equally firm belief that, if the dread of involving ourselves or any other cause leads us to permit Russia to conquer and occupy Persia, our continual collision with that State in Asia will be destructive of all hopes of continued peace in Europe; and that if we escape from the means of attack, such passive policy would allow Russia to accumulate, our finances must sink under the weight of the great increase of our military expenditure, even supposing that limited to defensive preparation.

'The Supreme Government have expressed views as to our alliance with the countries of Persia and Bagdad that appear different from those I have stated, but there must be a point at which threatened danger is to be met, and the means to be employed must depend upon the scenes in which we have to act, and the nature of the interests we have to defend. In this, as in all similar cases, difference of opinion must exist; my own, formed on experience and reflection, is, that if it had been the past policy of the Indian Government, or becomes that of the future, to abstain from all intercourse except commercial, with the intermediate States between India and Europe, and to allow Russia to advance her power unobstructed to our frontier, a hundred times the means of money and men will not suffice to repel the attack, to that which well employed might have kept it at a distance.

'I never was an advocate for wasting our resources of men or money in remote countries and on unfavourable terms against European Powers; but I deem it politic on every ground to throw all the obstructions we can to oppose the advance of Russia, or any other State, towards our Indian possessions; and I am quite satisfied that not to employ the ample and various means we possess to effect such an object is to abandon those outworks which, well defended, must render the empire of India impregnable to an European Power.'

Although these passages refer to events long subsequent to those immediately before us, we introduce them in this place because they contain the substance of Sir John Malcolm's experience of Persian politics; and they serve to remind us of the incalculable importance of causing British interests to be represented, especially in the remote courts of Asia, by a higher class of men than the Government have been of late enabled to send there. The Court of Directors complained of the expense

of Sir John Malcolm's missions; but no mission which leaves behind it the seeds of amity and goodwill can be called expensive, in comparison with the outlay of a few months of discord and hostilities. It may here be added, to conclude this part of the subject, that in 1810 Sir John Malcolm was again sent to Persia by Lord Minto, then Governor-general of India. But this mission only gave rise to most unbecoming squabbles between the representative of the Indian Government and Sir Harford Jones, the King's minister at Teheran, which Mr. Kaye has related with unnecessary prolixity, and with a degree of asperity towards Sir Harford Jones not altogether justified by the facts of the case. Malcolm was received with marked distinction by the Shah, but no political results whatever followed this second journey. A strange fatality seemed to hang over these missions. The treaties negotiated by Malcolm in 1799 were sent back to India for ratification by a Persian nobleman, Hadjee Khalil Khan, who was unluckily murdered in a riot soon after his arrival at Bombay; and on the return of Malcolm to Persia in 1810, two of the young gentlemen attached to his suite, Captain Grant and Lieutenant Fotheringham, were murdered by banditti on their way from Bagdad, owing, it must be confessed, to their own imprudence. Sir John Malcolm was extremely affected by this painful incident, and with characteristic warmth of feeling, he immediately attributed it to the zeal and attachment inspired by himself to his subordinates.

We now revert, however, to the regular progress of his career, and to the most important transactions in which it was his fate to be engaged. On his return from Persia Malcolm was for the first time brought into close personal communication with Lord Wellesley, by his temporary appointment as Private Secretary to the Governor-general, and the confidence placed in him by the head of the Indian Government may be inferred from the fact that he was soon afterwards selected to fill the Residency of Mysore. This appointment, however, Malcolm surrendered with great disinterestedness in order to retain Mr. Webbe in the Madras Government, and allay the irritation which some ill-advised orders of the Court of Directors had occasioned. These incidents are, however, of mere passing interest, and the political reputation of Sir John Malcolm rests more firmly on the part he took in the first great Mahratta war.

Whatever may have been the apprehensions caused to the Government of India by the hostile attitudes and foreign correspondence of Tippoo Sultan, or by the threats of the Dooranee Prince who hovered along the north-western frontier, the real obstacles to be overcome, the real danger to be removed, lay in

that confederacy of the native Princes of India which still occupied the most important portion of the territory of Hindostan. Fortunately for the Company, the Mahratta Princes were divided by their national alliances and by their internal quarrels. The Peishwa, as he was termed from his hereditary office held under the Mogul Empire, had long been nominally regarded as the head and chief executive authority of the Mahrattas, and the chieftains of the race were ostensibly considered as his subjects and officers. But these subjects and officers contended with unremitting violence for ascendancy at the Court of Poonah, which was alternately swayed by the ascendancy of Scindiah or the armed resistance of Holkar. Lord Cornwallis and Lord Wellesley had both assumed that the Peishwa was the representative of the Mahratta power, and treated with him accordingly; but this alliance was viewed with the utmost jealousy by the feudatory Mahratta States, whose independence was alike threatened by the steady progress of British influence and by the increased authority of their own chief; and at length these chiefs possessed themselves of the whole authority of the Peishwa, who took refuge in the Presidency of Bombay. The policy adopted by Lord Wellesley was to reduce the usurped power of the Mahratta chiefs, and to restore the Peishwa to his throne upon conditions dictated by the British Government. The treaty of Bassein gave a permanent and binding form to this agreement. Whatever expectations may have been entertained of the submission of the chiefs to such an arrangement, these expectations were not realised, and orders were immediately given to General Arthur Wellesley to advance upon Poonah, whilst the army of the North under General Lake was to invade that part of Scindiah's dominions which lay between the Jumna and the Ganges, to occupy Delhi and Agra, to annex Bundelcund, and to take possession of the person and nominal authority of the Mogul.

With what rapidity and what success these objects were accomplished is familiar to every man who knows the history of our Indian conquests, though perhaps less familiar than such events ought to be to the great bulk of the British nation. Our present object is confined to the part taken by Malcolm in these transactions. He joined the army at Madras which was advancing to the west under General Wellesley and General Stuart in March 1803, but rather in a political than a military capacity,—to conduct the negotiations whilst the future champion of England's greatness led on the troops.

‘The force under General Wellesley pushed forward to Poonah with a rapidity which assured our friends and disconcerted our

enemies. Alarmed by the approach of the British troops, Holkar had quitted the Mahratta capital, leaving a detachment of some fifteen hundred men there under the command of one of his lieutenants. This man had purposed, or been instructed, to lay the city in ashes before the English could enter the streets; but the forced marches of Wellesley's light troops brought them to the gates of Poonah before the Mahratta chief could give effect to this design, and the capital of the Peishwah was saved.' (Vol. i. p. 214.)

All hopes of maintaining peace were not, however, abandoned until June, when Lord Wellesley invested his illustrious brother with full political and military powers in the Mahratta country, and the war began. It is obvious that with Lord Wellesley to project these great operations, which he did with a vigour and precision recorded in his own imperishable dispatches, and with the Duke of Wellington to execute them, the part of Malcolm was reduced to a slender and indefinite one. He was in fact without power. He was suffering from illness, and indeed was obliged to quit the camp whilst the army pushed on to the siege of Ahmednuggur and to the victory of Assaye, which was described by the conqueror in the following characteristic note.

'GENERAL WELLESLEY TO MAJOR MALCOLM.

'Camp, Sept. 26. 1803.

'My dear Malcolm,—Colonel Close will have informed you of our victory on the 23rd. Our loss has been very severe, but we have got more than ninety guns, seventy of which are the finest brass ordnance I have ever seen. The enemy, in great consternation, are gone down the Ghauts. Stevenson follows them to-morrow. I am obliged to halt, to remove my wounded to Dowlatabad.

'It is reported that Jadoon-Row is missing. They say that Scindiah and Ragojee are stupified by their defeat. They don't know what to do, and reproach each other. Their baggage was plundered by their own people, and many of their troops are gone off.

'I return your letter. I send Mr. Duncan this day a copy of my letter to the Governor-general, in which you will see a detail of the action.

'Believe me ever yours most sincerely,

'ARTHUR WELLESLEY.

'The bay horse was shot under me, and Diomed was kicked, so that I am not now sufficiently mounted. Will you let me have the grey Arab? I must also request you to get for me two good saddles and bridles.' (Vol. i. p. 232-33.)

The campaign proceeded with the most brilliant success.

'The autumn of 1803 was a season of intense excitement from one end of India to the other. To the English it was one of glorious

excitement. Never had so many great successes been achieved within so small a circle of time. As Malcolm once more journeyed into the heart of the peninsula, "one news came huddling on another" of victory—and victory—and victory. Whilst Wellesley was operating triumphantly on the plains of Berar, Lake, with equal success, was breaking up the Mahratta power on the banks of the Jumna. Alighur, Delhi, Agra, had fallen before the battalions of the latter, and now, at Poonah, Malcolm learnt that the veteran commander had fought a great battle at Laswarrie, and routed the flower of Scindiah's disciplined troops. Boorhampore and Asseeghur had fallen before the Hyderabad subsidiary force under Colonel Stevenson; and then came tidings to the effect that General Wellesley had met the enemy again, and disastrously beaten them at Argaum. It was palpable to Malcolm, as he proceeded onward to join Wellesley's camp, that nothing was left to the Mahratta confederates but to sue ignominiously for terms.' (Vol. i. p. 235-36.)

Malcolm, recovered from his illness, returned in December to the army, and found his way to General Wellesley by the sound of the cannonade against the fort of Gawilghur. But in fact the contest was over, and on the following day a convention was signed between the British Commander and the Vakeel of the Mahratta Princes, which opened the negotiations for peace.

'On the day following the arrival of Wattel Punt, there was a grand conference in the General's tent, when the great question of peace, and the conditions on which the English Government could consent to make it, were fully discussed. That Government was represented by General Wellesley and Major Malcolm. A third English diplomatist was also present, and took part in the negotiations. The two whom I have named were young men. The third was some ten years younger. Mountstuart Elphinstone had first gone to the Mahratta country, a few years before, as an assistant to Colonel Close at Poonah; and so rapid had been the growth of his knowledge and experience, and such were the early evidences of those rare diplomatic and administrative powers which subsequently placed him in the first rank of Indian statesmen, that he was selected, on the departure of Malcolm to Bombay, to be General Wellesley's political assistant. In that capacity, having joined the General's camp at Ahmednuggur, he had been a participator in all those great military operations which had laid the foundation of Arthur Wellesley's renown, and had brought the Mahratta chiefs as suppliants to the feet of the English General.' (Vol. i. p. 241-42.)

It was therefore to Mr. Mountstuart Elphinstone, and not to Sir John Malcolm, that the credit of concluding these negotiations belonged. The treaty of peace was, however, shortly afterwards signed, and Malcolm was sent with it to the Mahratta camp to obtain the ratification of Scindiah's Durbar.

"We were well received," he wrote to General Wellesley, "by the Maharajah, who is a good-looking young man. He preserved great gravity when we first went in; and probably we might have left him without seeing that his gravity was affected, had not a ridiculous incident moved his muscles. A severe shower took place whilst we were in his tent. The water lodged on the flat part of the tent, under which Mr. Pepper was seated, and all at once burst in a torrent upon his head. From the midst of the torrent we heard a voice exclaim, '*Jesus!*' and soon after poor Pepper emerged. The Maharajah laughed loud, and we all joined chorus. A shower of hail followed the rain, and hailstones were brought in and presented in all quarters. My hands were soon filled with them by the politeness of Dowlut Rao and his Ministers; and all began to eat, or rather to drink them. For ten minutes the scene more resembled a school at the moment when the boys have gone to play than an Eastern Durbar. We parted in great good humour; and, as far as I can judge from physiognomy, every one in camp is rejoiced at the termination of hostilities." (Vol. i. p. 245-46.)

Considerable difficulties were however raised by the enemy, and an attempt was made to alter the provisions of the treaty. One of the fresh conditions they attempted to introduce was, that 'the English Government should agree, out of respect for the firman of the King, out of regard for the tribe of the Peishwa, out of friendship for the Maharajah, and with a view to increase its own reputation among the natives of the country, to allow no cows to be killed in Hindostan.' Malcolm, however, held his own ground and remained provisionally at the Court of Scindiah.

A more serious difficulty arose with reference to his possession of the fort residence of Gwalior, which Scindiah claimed as a portion of the territory still allotted to him by the treaty he had just concluded. Malcolm was strongly of opinion that his claim was a fair one, and that justice as well as policy compelled us to yield the point. The Duke of Wellington, when he became acquainted with the facts, entirely concurred in this view of the case.

"I would sacrifice Gwalior," he wrote to Malcolm, "or every frontier of India ten times over, in order to preserve our credit for scrupulous good faith, and the advantages and honour we gained by the late war and the peace; and we must not fritter them away in arguments drawn from overstrained principles of the laws of nations, which are not understood in this country. What brought me through many difficulties in the war, and the negotiations of peace? The British good faith, and nothing else." (Vol. i. p. 269.)

But to these liberal views the Governor-general was firmly opposed; and the correspondence of Lord Wellesley on this

subject discloses to a painful degree the haughty and imperious spirit with which that eminent personage resented contradiction.

‘His anger was so great that he could not contain himself till the morning. Mortified and indignant, he desired his private secretary, late as it was, to despatch at once a letter to Major Malcolm, expressive of the extreme displeasure of the Governor-general. So Shawe reluctantly wrote:—

‘“I am sorry to tell you that your last letters have rekindled all Lord Wellesley’s displeasure on the subject of Gwalior and Gohud, and upon your listening to the claims fabricated by Bappoo Wattel to the restoration of those possessions, and to the complaints of Scindiah’s Ministers upon every question that occurs, which Lord Wellesley desires me to say, are framed in a tone and spirit which are insulting to the British character, and are delivered rather in the language of conquerors than of the vanquished.”’ (Vol. i. p. 274.)

‘It will be gathered from these letters that Lord Wellesley’s irritation was extreme. But nothing had so clearly revealed to me how deeply he felt what he considered Malcolm’s “disobedience” as a circumstance perhaps unknown to the latter, whose private letters to Edmonstone and Shawe were, as I have said, by his Excellency’s desire, submitted to the Governor-general. In one of these, addressed to Edmonstone, Malcolm wrote: “God knows, throughout the whole of this troubled scene my attention has been exclusively directed to one object—the promotion of the public interests.” These last two words, on reading the letter, Lord Wellesley underscored, and appended to them this note in the margin—“Mr. Malcolm’s duty is to obey my orders and to enforce my instructions. I will look after the public interests.”’ (Vol. i. p. 275–76.)

In this critical situation, the approval and sympathy of the Duke of Wellington still supported Malcolm. In one of the friendly letters which Mr. Kaye has preserved, he says, ‘I saw the notes to which you allude, and think them quite shocking. You did not deserve such treatment, positively, and I am not astonished at its having distressed you.’ Soon afterwards, however, Lord Wellesley himself condescended to appease his perplexed agent and distressed friend by a stately epistle; and Malcolm, who was certainly one of the most placable of mankind, immediately replied that ‘this extraordinary kindness of his lordship had completely banished from his memory every painful feeling, and has filled his mind with sentiments of the warmest gratitude and most devoted attachment.’ He was however, already relieved at Scindiah’s Durbar by Mr. Webbe, the regular Resident; and at a subsequent period Gwalior was actually restored to Scindiah and his family.

Our limits forbid us to follow Sir John Malcolm through

the multifarious transactions in which he continued to be engaged after Sir Arthur Wellesley and Lord Wellesley had left India, under the administrations of Lord Cornwallis, Sir G. Barlow, Lord Minto, and Lord Moira. Many of them are related by himself in great detail in letters addressed to these eminent men, who retained all their friendship for him; and it is due to Malcolm to say, that when men of more contracted abilities or of inferior resolution assumed the government of India he at least ever remained faithful to the lofty principles of action he had learnt in the cabinet and the camp of the Wellesleys. In 1811 he returned to Europe, and remained at home during the last triumphant years of the war, evidently mortified by the practical exclusion he underwent, as an Indian officer and political servant, from the great affairs of Europe. On this subject he received the following characteristic letter from Lord Wellington, then near Pampeluna (June, 1813).

‘LORD WELLINGTON TO COLONEL MALCOLM.

‘Near Pampeluna, June 26. 1813.

‘My dear Malcolm, — I am very much obliged to you for your letter of the 22nd of May, which I received by the last post, and for the sword which you have given me I have not much leisure to attend now to Indian concerns, although I always feel an interest about them. I have been frequently astonished at the indifference with which public men in England considered the talents of those who had served in India, possibly because I was partial to those endowed with them, and entertained a higher opinion of those talents than the Ministers. But the fact is so. We must observe, however, that to hold office in England is a favour conferred upon the individual, and is not a right, as it is in India; and he who has the disposal of the patronage of the Crown must be induced to bestow office by motives of friendship for the individual, by a sense that he can serve his interests, or is more eminently qualified than another to serve the public. Although I had long been in habits of friendship with the public men of the day, and had some professional claims to public notice when I returned to England, I believe I should have been but little known, and should not be what I am, if I had not gone into Parliament. I would, therefore, advise you to go into Parliament if you can afford it, if you look to high public employment. I likewise recommend to you not to fix yourself upon Lord Wellesley, or any other great man. You are big enough, unless much altered, to walk alone; and you will accomplish your object soonest in that way. Don’t, however, be in a hurry.

‘You will hear of events here. I have taken more guns from these fellows in the last action than I took at Assaye, without much more loss, upon about seventy thousand men engaged. The two

armies were nearly equal in numbers, but they cannot stand us now at all.

‘Ever, my dear Malcolm, yours most sincerely,
‘WELLINGTON.’ *

Parliament still remained closed against him. This period of leisure was employed in the publication of the *History of Persia*; and when the battle of Waterloo had again opened the continent to Englishmen, he found his old friend of Ahmed-nuggur and Gawilghur at Paris, in the proudest position in Europe. The journal kept by Malcolm during this visit to Paris, when he was in daily communication with the Duke of Wellington and the Russian generals, is one of the most curious and amusing portions of his voluminous papers.

Conscious, however, that India was the true field of his activity, he returned there in 1817, Lord Moira being then Governor-general. And it was fortunate both for himself and for the Indian Empire that he did so, for his re-appearance on the scene he knew so well, coincided with the outbreak of the second Mahratta war, and enabled him to take a decisive part in the settlement of questions which were still threatening the tranquillity and safety of the British dominions. He was at once named by Lord Moira agent of the Governor-general in the Deccan, with the military rank of brigadier—a post which he described as the most active and prominent situation he could fill in all India. In this capacity he made a tour of the southern Residencies and visited the Peishwah at Poonah; but the uneasiness and disaffection of the Mahratta Princes shortly afterwards exploded in violence, and the contest between them and the British forces was renewed, in spite of the enormous increase of power and stability which an interval of fourteen years had given to the British Government. At length Malcolm's military ambition was gratified by the opportunity of commanding the advanced brigades of the army under Sir T. Hislop, at the battle of Mehidpoor, where he displayed great skill and coolness, took the Mahratta camp, and finally annihilated the military power of Holkar. In the midst of this triumph and its results, it is remarkable that Malcolm retains a clear adherence to the political system of his great master:—

‘The Pindarrees,’ he wrote in another letter, ‘are now giving themselves up by hundreds. Where are now the fools who said we could not do this thing? Never was a more glorious result. The noble views of Lord Wellesley of establishing general tranquillity are

now nearly accomplished; and if we have firmness and wisdom to preserve and maintain the great advantages we have gained, India will long enjoy an undisturbed peace.' (Vol. ii. p. 229.)

The Peishwah next surrendered, as much to the personal ascendancy of Malcolm, who did not hesitate to visit the Mahratta Prince in his own hostile camp, as to the military forces which commanded his position: and throughout this transaction the utmost knowledge of the country and the people was shown by the British commander. Badjee Rao abdicated his sovereign power for a pension of eight lacs, and the war ended by the voluntary submission of the first Hindoo prince to become a pensioner of the English Government. The final settlement and pacification of the fertile and important district of Malwah, which had been continually devastated by the raids of Pindarrees and the wars of Mahratta chiefs, was the immediate result and the great reward of this achievement; and no service could be more essential to the future peace and prosperity of India. Malcolm's delight was extreme:—

'The countries of Holkar,' he writes, 'are advancing to prosperity with a rapidity that looks almost miraculous to those who are unacquainted with the patience, industry, and attachment to the soil of the Ryots of India. They actually have reappeared in thousands, like people come out of the earth, to claim and recultivate lands that have been fallow for twenty years.' (Vol. ii. p. 276.)

And writing some years afterwards to his wife from the spot which had witnessed his triumph of Mehidpoor, he says very pleasingly,—

'I cannot pass this spot without writing to you. ~~When I look~~ from my tent upon the field where we conquered, ~~and think of the~~ many gallant fellows whose bones are scattered over it, what gratitude have I to God for having preserved me for the great joy of once again meeting you and the dear children. Of all the feelings connected with Mehidpoor none is so cherished by me as the knowledge of that happiness and pride with which you heard that your husband had done his duty on that day. What a contrast has this country known between the three years that preceded, and the three that have followed, that action. Its inhabitants had lost all—even hope; its fields were desolate, and houses roofless. Now we might challenge India—I might almost say the world—to produce a country where there are fewer crimes, or more general happiness and comfort—exemption from domestic and foreign foes.' (Vol. ii. p. 333.)

These ~~and the~~ results of the British conquest of India, to which we look with the most unqualified satisfaction. Barely forty years have elapsed, since territories in the very centre of

Hindustan have been rescued from the incessant repetition of all the horrors of native warfare. For the first time in their history we have given them peace—a peace likely to remain unbroken as long as the British empire in India retains its power.

‘When we crossed the Nerbudda in 1817, the state of Malwah was scarcely to be described. It was a country without government, a state without revenue, an army without pay; consequently, a peasantry without protection from the villanies of the troops of their own sovereigns, or from any set of depredators who chose to plunder them, and of these last the country was full. We now see around us the effects of our late operations in dispersing the unruly and licentious troops belonging to the family of Holkar, and repressing and keeping under everything in the shape of systematic plunder; a state though at present reduced in respect of revenue, yet respectable; that revenue increasing, and perhaps the finest country in India again wearing the face of cheerful industry; the inhabitants, assured of protection, returning to their villages, and looking forward with confidence to better times.’ (Vol. ii. p. 310.)

But while Malcolm was exulting in the successful performance of these honourable duties in Central India, his ambition received a severe blow—a blow which told even more severely upon his high opinion of his own powers than upon his ambition—by the nomination of Mr. Mountstuart Elphinstone to the government of Bombay: and this disappointment was renewed in 1829, by the appointment of Sir Thomas Munro to the Government of Madras. Both these eminent men were his friends, rather than his rivals; but he resented the preference which the Court of Directors had given to their claims over his own. In spite of the evidence of Sir John Malcolm’s zeal and activity contained in these volumes, we must confess that we think the decision of the Court of Directors was perfectly right, and that Mr. Mountstuart Elphinstone and Sir T. Munro had claims, from the superior power of their minds, and from the unassuming modesty of their characters, which the services of Sir John Malcolm could not surpass. Malcolm, however, took a different view of the subject.

‘I have endeavoured to impress these truths upon Adam and Metcalfe, and can now do this more at liberty, as I am personally much out of the question. Juggled and ousted from the succession to Bombay as I have been by intrigue and prejudice, I shall not stay in India, unless in such rank and station as has been proposed for me—as Lieutenant-Governor of the conquered ~~provinces~~. The time will come soon—I wish it was arrived—when there will be a *Lieutenant-Governor for Central India*! and I should then prefer fixing my *mountain throne* amid the ruins of Mandoo (from

which I returned yesterday, gratified beyond description) even to Poonah. I have already brought the plundering Bheels of that once *royal land* to till ground that has been fallow for near a century. These are all dreams. I shall be satisfied with having given a good impulse, shall probably shake you by the hand in November, take your commands for England in December, and there take a farm.' (Vol. ii. p. 309.)

This scheme, however, met with little favour from Lord Hastings and the Court of Directors, though it has since been realised in another form, by the creation of the lieutenant-governorship of the North-western provinces of Bengal: and to a farm in Hertfordshire, the aspirant after these high honours did return. If, however, some disappointment mingled itself with Malcolm's return to Europe, that pang was soon forgotten in the delight with which he found himself surrounded by an affectionate family, and by his hearty enjoyment of the life of an English country gentleman.

But whilst he enjoyed the freedom, the leisure, and the society of Europe, he never ceased to pursue the objects of his constant ambition, and he was successively again a candidate for the offices of Governor of Madras and Governor of Bombay. Nor did he renounce the crowning object of the governor-generalship of India. His exertions were at length partially rewarded by the appointment to Bombay, which he accepted in opposition to the advice of the Duke of Wellington; but he afterwards saw reason to regret that he had not followed that advice. The principal event of his government was an unfortunate squabble with the Chief Justice; but more permanent results have marked his administration from the judicious encouragement he gave to cotton and silk cultivation, and to the establishment of steam communication with England. He left India for the fourth and last time in 1830, and reached England at a moment when his countrymen were engaged in a contest for Reform, which involved principles diametrically opposed to those of his own political experience. On these topics it is, however, unnecessary for us to dwell, and the pages which Mr. Kaye has devoted to them, might have been omitted without any detriment to the fame of his hero. Of the general estimate of Sir John Malcolm's powers recorded by his biographer, we have already expressed our opinion; but although we do not entirely subscribe to the tone of lofty panegyric he has adopted, we agree with him that the marvellous history of British India scarcely furnishes a more remarkable instance of a man who rose, entirely by his own energy and application, to some of the highest offices in that portion of the empire,—that he dis-

played in all the duties and relations of life a warm-hearted and unselfish disposition,—and that among the Englishmen who have ruled in India, none have left a name more deservedly respected and beloved by the people of that country.

ART. V. — *La Roumanie.* Par B. BOERESCO. Paris: 1856.

TO deliver the Moldo-Wallachian provinces from a Russian invasion was the first object of the late war; to constitute the government and future condition of those provinces on a safe, permanent, and liberal basis is the last object of the peace. To these objects the policy of the Western Powers and of Turkey herself is irrevocably pledged; and the degree of success which may in this respect attend our efforts will be no unfair criterion of the results of the late contest. When we engaged in it we found Russia invested by successive treaties with a right of interference in the affairs of the Principalities which amounted in her own estimation, and in the opinion of a large section of the population, to a Protectorate. Repeated invasions had familiarised her with the occupation of the country, and the absolute command which Russia had acquired of both banks of the Danube, from the confluence of the Pruth to its mouth, gave her a preponderating influence over the adjacent States on that great river. The peace of Paris has annihilated that Protectorate. An invasion of the Principalities by Russia would henceforth be regarded as an outrage on the public law of Europe, to which those States now belong. The Danube in all its course waters no portion of the Russian territory, and a considerable portion of Bessarabia has actually been restored to Moldavia.

But whilst we rejoice in these consequences of the late war, which have effectually removed one of the dangers that continually menaced the independence of the East and the tranquillity of Europe, we are sensible that the work of the Allies is not complete until the immunities of the Principalities shall be secured by a form of government at least as independent as that they owed to the interested interposition of Russia, and until their social condition is so consolidated as to oppose a national barrier between the Russian and the Turkish Empires. The territories of the Principalities have been for ages the Flanders of the East—the scene of incessant contests between the Hun and the Greek, the Pole and the Wallach, the Russ and the Turk. No country has been more frequently devastated by war; but none is better adapted by its position and natural fertility to give an additional pledge of the maintenance of peace.

Unhappily, in the course of the negotiations which followed the cessation of hostilities and the conclusion of peace, considerable differences have arisen between the several cabinets of Europe as to the most effectual mode of accomplishing this object. The French Government adopted, throughout these discussions, the plan for uniting the Principalities in one State; and this union is undoubtedly desired as the *sine quâ non* of a real political existence by all that is eminent and patriotic amongst the people. This proposal was acceded to, though more coldly, by Russia. But it was so strenuously opposed by Austria and by Turkey, that it became impossible and unadvisable to adopt it precipitately. It was but fair to consider the objections of these Powers, and to examine into the truth or justice of their objections. Nor could the union of the Principalities be discussed or decided in an isolated manner, apart from the institutions on which it may be based, or from the character and connexions of the prince whose election may consolidate and crown it.

It should be borne in mind that during the negotiations at Vienna, in 1855, as well the negotiations at Paris, in 1856, these topics had been discussed. Lord John Russell remarked in the former Conference that 'the importance of the union of the two Principalities into one, the government for life or hereditary of the hospodars, the opportunity of a national representation had not escaped him,' though these questions were adjourned out of deference to the Porte. The French minister at Vienna had read an excellent memorandum in favour of the union of the provinces under an hereditary prince chosen from one of the reigning houses of Europe, but tributary to the Sultan. At Paris the subject was resumed. It is recorded in the Sixth Protocol of the Congress, that 'The first Plenipotentiary of France conceives that as the union of the two provinces satisfies the requirements brought to light by an attentive investigation into their true interests, the Congress should admit and proclaim it.

'The first Plenipotentiary of Great Britain shares in and supports this opinion, relying especially on the utility and expediency of taking into serious consideration the wishes of the people, which it is always right,' he adds, 'to take into account.'

The proposal was resisted by the ministers of Austria and Turkey: but the Treaty itself provided that a European commission should decide the bases of the future organisation of the Principalities, and that the Sultan should convocate Divans so constituted as to represent closely the interests of all classes of society, which were to express the wishes of the people on the subject.

Unfortunately for the inhabitants, subsequent events were not calculated to remove the obstacles in the way of their desires. During a long and intricate series of negotiations, France placed itself no longer by the side of her late allies, but by that of her recent foe. The view which France took of every contested question was the Russian one. The French and Russian Ambassadors at Constantinople laboured together at the same oar, and became associated in a succession of acts so antagonistic to England and to Austria, as irresistibly to force these Powers into an understanding for mutual defence; thus reversing the alliance and the policy which had effected the successful termination of the war.

These circumstances may well explain the subsequent hesitation of the English Government in acceding to the wishes of the Principalities, and the repugnance of our diplomatists to lend their aid to a scheme supported by powers and personages so notoriously hostile. Such jealousies and resentments, however, do not lead to a due and calm consideration of the question itself, nor are they calculated to furnish a just decision upon its real merits.

Although these arrangements have hitherto been thwarted by diplomatic perplexities, their importance is not to be judged of solely in reference to foreign influences, but by the character and wants of the countries to which these arrangements are to apply; and it would be a scandalous failure in one of the great objects of the war if we failed, having the power in our own hands, to establish a sound national government over the Moldo-Wallachians, or, to call them by their more accurate common denomination, over the people of Roumania.

Let us now turn therefore to the countries themselves, and consider what elements of political strength they possess, and how far they may be trusted with the development of these powers in order to form a barrier against Russian ambition, without becoming at the same time a source of weakness and anxiety to Turkey.

The first characteristic of the Rouman race is the tenacity with which they have during so many centuries defended their distinct existence. Other races have preserved their nationality in impervious nooks or insular positions, but Moldo-Wallachia lies on the high road from the steppes to the fertile regions of the Danube. All the barbarian tribes passed it in succession, but never settled there; and the descendants of Trajan's colonists, accustomed to retire to the mountains from invasion, and to return to the cultivation of the plain when the invaders had passed, still people their old country, refusing amalgamation and flinging off

all subjection that is not of a merely nominal kind. From the earliest time the Roumans maintained their independence by arms. In alliance with the Bulgarians they resisted the Greek Empire. After the terrible invasion of Genghis Khan in the 13th century, the Wallachs and Moldavians rallied each under a native Duke. At the close of the 14th century appeared the Turks, who were obliged to humble the Danubians ere they could successfully attempt to reduce Constantinople. The Ottoman never encountered more stubborn or more chivalric foes. The great Sultans therefore respected them, and as the price of their neutrality or adhesion, merely demanded nominal tribute, stipulating in turn that no Turk should pass the Danube, but that the Moldo-Wallachs should continue to elect their own princes and be governed by their own laws. It was this very independence, that induced so many of the principal Greek families of Constantinople to migrate from that capital and settle in Moldo-Wallachia, where the Cantacuzenes and Palæologi flourish to this day. The traditions and counsels of these new comers greatly tended to sap the military institutions and hardihood of the Roumans, and to substitute for them the supple habits and functionary aristocracy of the Greeks. Against them as their most insidious enemies the Roumans long struggled. And under their most heroic kings, Stephen the Great and Michael the Brave, the spirit of Rouman nationality shone forth in more than primitive splendour, repelling on all sides Pole, Hungarian, and Turk. But as Poland declined, as Hungary was absorbed, and the Turks lost that martial impulse which gave them all their high qualities, the Moldo-Wallachian spirit subsided too; rascality succeeded to chivalry, and tax-jobbers to the soldier. The peasant, accustomed to cultivate the soil as the common property of all classes, though in unequal proportions, sank gradually to the Slavonian condition of a serf, compelled to labour and fettered to the soil. His ancient right of electing his own chiefs and magistrates lapsed also. The nobles or Boyards, instead of electing their princes, were compelled to receive them at the hand of the Porte, which made choice for these offices of the rich Greeks of the Fanar, and of those amongst them who could pay the largest price. The aim of the Hospodars who had thus attained to power was of course to make as much money of it as possible in as short a time. Hence rapine became the sole aim and the sole task of government, the country being disarmed lest it should resist. The Hospodars brought Arnaouts to protect their persons and enforce their demands. The result of something short of a century of life-hospodorates under Turk-

ish nomination was, that as Russia took the place of Poland, and advanced towards the Euxine and the Danube, it succeeded in extending its alliance and protection over the Roumans, oppressed, spoiled, and depopulated by the Fanariot nominees of the Porte. Under this system of government the Principalities offered no defence to Turkey, no barrier against Russia. And had not the convulsions and the wars of Europe driven Russia to the duties of defence and of conquest on her northern and western frontier, she could not have failed to have established her power permanently and irresistibly on the Danube, as was shown by the secret articles of the Treaty of Tilsit.

The great convulsions of Europe, however, enabled the Roumans to recover spirit and reassert their rights. In 1820, when the Greeks resolved to raise an insurrection of Christian against Turk, and when the Morea and the islands obeyed the call, Ypsilanti entered the Principalities and unfolded his standard. Far from arriving to his succour, the Wallachs flocked to a native standard under Vladimiresco, who expressed the Rouman feeling when he declared that the want and the desire of the Principalities was to be delivered, not from the Turks, but from the Fanariot Greeks, who had so long governed them. And the Rouman chief concluded by calling in the aid of the Turks to put down Ypsilanti and his band.

This spontaneous resolution of the Moldo-Wallachs in 1820 probably saved the Turkish Empire, at least in Europe, from perdition. Had Ypsilanti succeeded in his northern insurrection, Servia would probably have joined him, and the flame of rebellion would have spread to Bulgaria and Roumelia. The Russians, under one pretext or another, would have poured in their swarms. The Turks themselves could not have refrained from the most sanguinary and revolting reprisals; and Europe, instead of fixing the frontier of Greece within the mountains of Thrace, would probably have had to provide for a new state of things in European Turkey.

The Turks professed to show their gratitude to the Moldo-Wallachs by giving them native Rouman hospodars in lieu of Fanariots. But they at the same time subjected them to severer burdens than pressed on them under the Fanariot princes, by leaving 35,000 men in the Principalities. At the same time, the spirit of nationality then beginning to develop itself amongst the Slavonians and the Magyars, acquired strength and impulse amongst the Roumans. The Greek language was everywhere repudiated, and the Roumans cultivated their national literature, under the patronage of Prince Ghika, the

hospodar of Wallachia, some specimens of which have recently been published in a very elegant form by the Hon. Henry Stanley.

The movement was avowedly anti-Greek and anti-Russian; and the Porte had but to respect its own treaties and the old privileges of the country, in order to see it assume an attitude, and display a spirit defiant of the Czar. But although the great Sultans of Turkey did not disdain to conciliate such Christian races as the Rouman, and even to respect their independence, the Turk of the present day does not see how he can rule without insolence, or how power can exist without oppression.

It cannot be denied that, although the Court of St. Petersburg probably acted from interested motives, and looked forward to the time when she should annex these provinces to her own empire, yet the stipulations introduced by Russia into the Treaty of Bucharest in 1813, the Treaty of Akermann in 1826, and, above all, the Treaty of Adrianople in 1829, did powerfully contribute to improve the condition and develop the resources of the Principalities. These treaties gave security to the Christians by causing the withdrawal of the Turkish forces from the left bank of the Danube; and they gave new life to the agricultural and commercial prosperity of the country by commuting the various exactions of the Porte into a fixed tribute, by granting freedom to trade, and by establishing a more independent administration. The change which took place in the aspect and cultivation of the soil was miraculous, and already in 1834 large exports of corn began to be made. The strongest evidence on this point is afforded by the rapid augmentation of the customs' revenue of Wallachia. In 1827 it did not exceed 800,000 piastres; in 1855 it had risen to nearly six millions of piastres: all the internal customs duties being abolished in the interval, and the tariff framed on a very moderate scale. The progress in the wealth and activity of the people in the last thirty years has been equally rapid and remarkable.

Such were the first and most beneficial results of the organisation of the provinces by General Kisseleff in 1831. With the aid of the Boyards he constructed a constitution or form of government, which, establishing the rule of an aristocracy under the protection of Russia, still gave it the form and the semblance of law. But the successors of Kisseleff were too brutal to tolerate the working of a responsible government. The Russian consuls put their yoke on the Hospodars, induced the Porte to suspend the national assemblies, and established that Russian dictatorship, which 1848 interrupted by a revolu-

tion, but which it required the campaign of 1854-55 to terminate altogether.

The few English writers or politicians who have touched on the subject of the Principalities have treated the inhabitants of these districts very cavalierly. They declare the Roumans to be unworthy of freedom and incapable of self-government. They deprecate the improvement of the race, or even the maintenance of their ancient rights and privileges. To unite the provinces, they allege, would embolden them to pretend to nationality, and this, it is asserted, not argued, would render them an easy prey to Russia. We must confess we see as little force as there is liberality in these arguments. The result of the war has been to place these countries, with their Christian population, at the disposal of the victorious Powers. We professed, when undertaking the war, that whilst resisting the pretensions of Russia to be the exclusive patron and protector of the Christian races of the Levant, we were fully determined to supply the place of Russia in seeing that these races were not trodden under foot. We thereby incurred a solemn and imperative duty towards the Christians who were *rayahs* of Turkey, and also towards the Christians who, like the Roumans, had remained free in the mass, subject to tribute and to political suzerainty, but preserving the great boon of self-government without Turkish interference, and without even the presence of Mussulmans upon their territory.

It is impossible—because it would be disgraceful—for England or for France to leave these provinces and their people worse off than they previously were. Nor can these nations suffer it to be said, that their governments have treated the Principalities with less consideration and justice than Russia had done. The Czar, as the result of two campaigns, secured to Servia a competent degree of freedom and independence under an hereditary prince. Servia remains still subject to the suzerainty of the Porte, sufficiently prosperous, self-governed, and free to form a solid bulwark against any aggression. Shall England and France, as the upshot of their campaigns, instead of doing something similar for the Moldo-Wallachs, abandon them to Turkish or to Austrian misrule, for the mere sake of conciliating the government of these countries? If so, what are the Christians of the East to think of our promises, our good faith, our generosity? With such an example of the reliance to be placed on the Powers of the West, and the kind of protection to be expected from them, will not the Christian race turn once more to Russia, as after all their most sincere and most constant friend?

It seems, nevertheless, to be the opinion of some Englishmen, that quite enough will have been done for the Roumans if they be left in the same condition in which the commencement of the century found them,—ruled, that is, by such emissaries as it may please the Porte from time to time to appoint under the authority of hospodars like those at Jassy and at Bucharest, with a council of Boyards, and revocable by the Porte should they prove incapable or false. Such is the condition chalked out for the Principalities. Moreover it is considered dangerous to encourage the Moldo-Wallachians to entertain a feeling of nationality. It is said to be unadvisable to trust them with arms. And therefore the garrisoning and defence of the country must be entrusted to Turkish troops, although this is a direct infringement of the ancient right and privileges of the Principalities, and although it would inevitably revive religious strife and intolerance with frequent collisions leading to military excesses and popular rebellion.

This is the system of constructing and governing the provinces insisted on by Austria and by Turkey, as the only one compatible with their security and that of the Principalities. This is the proposed method of executing that article of the Treaty of Paris which pledges the Powers to accomplish the definitive organisation of the Principalities in conformity with the wishes of the people. And several of our politicians, either thinking Austria and Turkey to be the best judges, or anxious to conciliate them, are prepared to adopt these views, and sacrifice the Moldo-Wallachs and their rights to such exigencies.

With every wish to leave undisturbed the security of Austria, and to add to rather than take from the strength of Turkey, this mode of treating the Roumans appears to us not only illiberal and unjust, but calculated to weaken Turkey, to disturb Austria, and to drive the Latin population, against their tendencies and their will, to make common cause with the Slavonian races on all sides of them in permanent antagonism to Turkey and in fierce distrust of the West.

The system of government which it is proposed to continue or to re-establish, is one that has had ample trial, and has borne its fruits in the misgovernment, depopulation, and impoverishment of the country, the corruption of its noblesse, the degradation of its peasantry, and the transfer of the real sovereignty and ascendancy in the country from the Sultan to the Czar. It is very natural for the Turks to desire to retain the nomination, septennial or otherwise, of the princes of the region. It is a symbol of power and a source of wealth. Each appointment brings from a quarter to half a million

sterling in bribes and fees to Constantinople. And it affords one of the few modes in which the Sultan can reward the chief of a great Christian family attached to him. But these reasons are not recommendations, but objections. In what we call corruption the Turks see nothing but what is licit and what is normal. The hospodar purchases his place,—of course his first care is to repair the breach in his fortune by appropriating to his private use the public revenue of his country. In this he is aided by ministers, who expect to enjoy the same privilege and have the same latitude. Every functionary in the Principalities, from the hospodar to the *darobars* or policemen, is removable at pleasure. The judges are not excepted. Those who get or those who retain their places at the accession of a new prince, or even a *caimacan*, must pay a fine either for the appointment or the renewal of it. Each in turn trades in the attributes of his office. If a judge, he vends his judgment; if a prefect, he fleeces the provincials; if a customs contractor, he robs the merchant. The whole action of life, from one end of the Principalities to the other under the hospodorate system, is nothing but a perpetual conjugation of the two verbs, to *bribe*, and to *plunder*.

There is but one way of putting an end to this infamous and universal traffic. This is to convert, as far as can be done, the temporary into the permanent, and the arbitrary into the legal. Make the prince hereditary, and instead of directing all his energies to amassing money for his family when he shall be out of power, he will consult his interest as a sovereign, and identify himself with the welfare and the affections of his people. Do away with the temporary Boyards, that functionary aristocracy which trades in politics and place. By giving security to the country, development to its resources, outlets to its trade, the landed proprietor will find the prudent and active management of his property to be the most profitable occupation for him. These pursuits will give him greater and higher interests, to protect which let him have a due share of political power. In fact, let there be an aristocracy supporting, not supported by, the state.

This noblesse we have, indeed, depicted as corrupt; but its corruption is a necessity and a consequence of the system. In no country do there exist more abundant materials for an intelligent, wealthy, honourable and independent aristocracy. The rising generation are already formed for these duties. They have grown and educated themselves in the confident hope that the present state of things could not last. They have imbibed all that advanced education which our western capitals can bestow. And the young boyards of Jassy and

Bucharest are as distinct in sentiment and in their estimate of political and public honesty from the old boyards, as the middle of the century is removed from its commencement.

But how are free institutions to be worked without a middle class? This class is not wanting in the Principalities, and is especially to be found in Wallachia. What are landed proprietors and farmers with incomes of from 150*l.* a year to 250*l.* but a middle class? What else are the lesser grade of functionaries, with similar salaries, constituting the Little Boyarie? Join to them the men who follow mercantile or professional pursuits, and the intermediate class is found, the existence of which has been veiled or denied by the sophism which considers the little boyard as a noble, and as forming one of an aristocratic caste. Far from there being no middle class in Wallachia, the nobles are in great numbers sinking into it (a fusion which the absence of hereditary titles favours), whilst men who have risen from the ranks of life are daily purchasers of their estates. In Moldavia the landed aristocracy is more wealthy, because it sooner found politics to be a losing trade. The Boyards, therefore, betook themselves to the management of their property, and from their remarkable perseverance and independent spirit have given rise to the remark, that Moldavia is the England, Wallachia the France, of the Principalities. The prevalence of the Jews has certainly impeded the formation of an urban middle class in Jassy. But let trade and profession be opened by the security and freedom of a fixed government, and a large citizen class would soon spring up in both Principalities.

To the common reproach of the non-existence of a middle class is added the kindred one that the peasants are serfs. But though oppressed, the Rouman peasant is not a serf. By giving warning to his landlord, he can quit his holding; and such is the scarcity of labour compared with the abundance of land, that he is always sure of obtaining the latter. Peasant serfage or slavery, as it exists in Russia, is unknown in the Principalities. The youth, who quits his holding or his father's home, is free as the man of any country. He can make money and save money, without paying any portion of it to any master. Many, in these years of high prices, have made considerable sums, which they would well know how to fructify, did the laws offer security, or the state of society any fair means of investment. The Rouman peasant has a right to a certain portion of the soil, which the landlord cannot refuse, and which must be in proportion to the number of oxen he possesses. Of the produce of the land he gives but one tenth to the landlord, in addition

to a number of days' labour in the year, varying from twelve to twenty. The Rouman peasant detests the system of forced labour. His pride repudiates it. Its abrogation on such terms as would satisfy the landlord would be welcomed as a boon by the peasant. And this must be one of the acts of the new government. Amidst the *corvéable* peasantry dwell a considerable number of peasant proprietors, *mosneni* as they are called, who ennoble the whole class and communicate to it a dignity unknown in Russia. Even the *corvéable* peasantry possess stock. It is not the lord who furnishes, but the cultivator who brings and owns his pair of oxen or his team. Every Wallachian has an equal right to purchase or hold land; and since the value of agricultural produce has become more apparent, the peasants are grown tenacious of what they possess, and eager to obtain more. Indeed, some of the large estates have lately been offered for sale in small lots with great success. On one property in the district of Bouczco four hundred peasants purchased lots of this kind, and paid for them on the spot at the rate of five ducats the *pogon*. Surely such men are as good as ten-pound freeholders for electoral purposes. Primary schools have very generally been established for the instruction of the young of this class. Austria is much opposed to their learning to read, for the same reason that she is opposed to the union of the Principalities—it would make the Roumans more troublesome neighbours.

There are some politicians amongst us who admit such truths as these, and who are accordingly prepared to combat the narrow views of Austria with regard to the Principalities. They would secure to the Roumans their ancient rights, their self-government in domestic matters, and the reform of their institutions and administration. But they shrink from affronting Austria by recommending the union of the provinces. With France possibly unfaithful, and Russia certainly hostile, they would do nothing calculated seriously to alienate Austria.

But without an altogether new state of things, such as the union would produce, reform will be impossible in the Principalities. Hospodars for a term of years or for life could not but govern as hospodars have ever done. Nor would this be remedied by elevating a Ghika or a Callimachi, and endowing them with hereditary principedoms. At Bucharest and at Jassy, they could not but fall into the same old routine, and be surrounded by the same old Boyards. Necessarily weak, the new prince would purchase the support of the old factions in the old way. Whilst the remainder would, as of old, recur to Austrian or to Russian protection, in order to intrigue or con-

spire first to embarrass, and then dethrone, a prince who would not employ them.

The nomination of a foreign prince by the Powers which conquered in the late war, with the guarantee of hereditary right and succession, would at once put an end to these intrigues. The ministers whom such a prince commanding the resources of the united Principalities might appoint, would command respect and adherence, independent of corruption. And supported as they would be by public opinion, and by the patriotic party, they could set at defiance every clique of Boyards who would seek to raise the old obstructions to the new government. The resistance of the chief of the state to the corrupt Boyards and old functionaries would be impracticable, were the government to continue local as at present, and under old influences at Jassy and Bucharest. Reform without union would be impossible.

The habit, continued during a long series of years, of elevating different families to the hospodorate, has had the result of creating several princely families, which are at deadly feud, which proscribe each other, and which have each their chosen and formidable band of partisans. Send a new hospodar to Bucharest, and how is he to resist the formidable opposition of the Stirbey and Bibesco families? Send another to Jassy, and he stumbles against the powerful Stourdzas. To give the hospodorate to either of these families, is to give it to Russia; to give it to their antagonists, is to place a dangerous body of opposition at the disposal of Russia. In either case, the aims of the protecting powers are thwarted. A foreign prince, with the united sway over both Principalities, could alone rise above such competition. A new hospodar at Jassy or at Bucharest could but appeal from one clique of Boyards to another. Having attained his eminence in defiance of the popular wish, he could not appeal to any popular opinion or party. Whilst a prince, raised to the chieftom of the united provinces, being himself and his family the great guarantees of Rouman freedom and right, would have a larger public, and an enthusiastic national feeling to appeal to and to lean upon, before which Boyard opposition and hospodariate envy must succumb.

Nor let it be imagined that the public sentiment of the Principalities, to be thus appealed to, is either democratic or dangerous. The feeling there, and the desire is, for a strong government, and for that moderate degree of liberty which suits a people not advanced in civilisation. There is no country so little revolutionary as Moldo-Wallachia, whatever Austrian statesmen may pretend to the contrary. Nor would any revolution have

broken out amongst them even in 1848, if the insolence and folly of Bibesco had not provoked and precipitated it.

The objection to a foreign prince upon the Danube, which perhaps has most weight with Englishmen, is the example of the king and people of Greece. Western Europe founded that kingdom from a purely generous impulse, and Otho would have repaid the boon by aiding Russia in its design to overrun the East, and annihilate western influence in the Levant. There are no cases, however, and no races, more totally different than those of Greece and of Roumania. The Greeks know of Russia nothing beyond its grandiloquence and its largesses. Russia is to Greece a power remote and unknown as Providence. But the Roumans know the Russians, and have been in contact with them—have felt their rapacity and their rod. Of them, the Roumans have had ample experience of late years, which has merely given force to the original dislike, and that indignant preference of the Turk to the Greco-Russ, which burst forth in 1820, under Vladimiresco. That chieftain's repudiation of Ypsilanti, and his calling in of the Turks, has been mentioned, and remains a standing proof that the Roumans may be trusted with the defence of Turkish interests and of the Turkish empire against Russia, provided the Turks respect the rights of the Roumans. *

These, though a brave and a muscular, are not a quarrelsome or ambitious people. They have the richest soil in Europe, and they are quite content to cultivate it without seeking fortune or domination elsewhere. The native Greek, whose bald mountains and stony valleys yield but a cheerless and barren soil, is compelled to look abroad for gain and even for livelihood. Turkey to his view retains the wealth and the fairest provinces of what was once a Christian and a Greek empire. And he is driven to turn the imperishable energy and intelligence of his race to the pursuits of commerce in all parts of the globe. The Rouman is under no such necessity, and entertains no such thought. His ambition and his pursuits are purely agricultural. His sources of wealth and prosperity are beneath his feet; and he only asks to be allowed peaceably to explore them.

What are the links of monarchic Greece with the West? That country sends us its currants, and takes in exchange the articles its scanty million of inhabitants may require. But the Principalities, containing five millions of inhabitants, would find two millions more to add to them by emigration, were the country tranquil. The soil would feed twice or thrice the population. In a few years there would be ten millions of

Roumans in the United Principalities,—a population equal to that of Persia, and far outnumbering that German race which forms the *nucleus* of the strength of Austria. Far from thus proving a weakness to Austria, it would in truth create for her a double barrier gained Russian ambition. Austria has no reason to fear Rouman aggression, as long as it respects Rouman rights. Whereas it might always count upon Rouman assistance in resisting any Slavonian invasion or uprising, the two great perils of the Austrian empire. Indeed, the independent and neutral attitude of Servia in the late war, which Russia did not dare to violate, is the best proof of the value of such a neighbour.

If the modern comparison of monarchic Greece tells against the Roumans, and their desire of union, so does the more ancient one of Poland. Statesmen deprecate the existence of a prince dependent on a representative assembly in the immediate vicinity of Russia, which might, as it did in the last century at Warsaw, entertain and pay parties in the diets to intrigue, embarrass, embroil, and finally overthrow the existing government. No doubt there are these facilities and these designs, as there are the means of suborning conspiracies and feeding revolutionary parties. But are those dangers prevented, and their inconvenience obviated, by profoundly discontenting the provinces, and by keeping a feeble power exposed to two distinct centres of intrigue at Jassy and at Bucharest?

But whilst we believe that the union of the provinces under the hereditary government of a prince not chosen from the native families of the country is the first condition of a successful and permanent organisation of the Principalities, a second condition of scarcely inferior importance is the maintenance of their territorial neutrality, and this condition can only be secured by the formal recognition of the great Powers. The neutrality of Belgium, the neutrality of Switzerland, have thus been recognised: like those small and free states, the Principalities must rely mainly on the public law of Europe for protection from their powerful military neighbours. Indeed, the fortresses of Belgium and the mountains of Switzerland are alike wanting in the valley of the Danube; and as for defence by Turkey, such a defence is in a military and political sense alike chimerical. The present Wallachian army, including the militia, amounts to 18,664, and the maintenance of this body of troops costs nearly one quarter of the revenue of the province. Such a body of troops is a considerable charge on a country whose population is scanty; and though it is too large for the mere purpose of

internal police, it is obviously incapable of resisting any external attack. The recognition of the neutrality of Roumania would be equally beneficial to the country itself, to its jealous and powerful neighbours, and to the mercantile relations of foreign nations.

On these grounds we trust that the temporary rivalry of the foreign embassies at Constantinople, and the interested opposition of the Divan, will not frustrate a settlement of this question on a broad and permanent basis. The weakness, the discontent, the division of the Principalities is the true cause of the influence Russia has exercised there. As long as these evils remain uncorrected she will have frequent opportunities to regain that influence; and we are satisfied that the Western Powers are as much bound in good policy as in good faith to fulfil their engagements towards the Principalities in the only manner which can secure a lasting claim to their gratitude.

ART. VI. — 1. *The Festal Letters of Athanasius*. Discovered in an ancient Syriac Version, and edited by WILLIAM CURETON, M.A. 8vo. London: 1848.

2. *Die Fest-Briefe des Heiligen Athanasius, Bischofs von Alexandria*. Aus dem Syrischen übersetzt und durch Anmerkungen erläutert von F. LARSEN. 8vo. Leipzig: 1852.

3. *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca Tomus Sextus continens in Parte I. Sancti Athanasii Epistolas Festales Syriace et Latine, cum Chronico et Fragmentis aliis*. 4to. Romæ: 1853.

4. *The Festal Epistles of S. Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria*. Translated from the Syriac, with notes and indices. 8vo. Oxford: 1854.

THE discovery and publication of a work so important for the history of the Church during the period to which it relates, and bearing the name of an author so celebrated throughout the whole extent of Christendom as Athanasius, although it does not appear to have excited much curiosity in England (for so far as we know, it was not even mentioned by more than one of our contemporaries*), has created sufficient interest in Protestant Germany to find an able translator in Dr. Larsen at Berlin, and in Catholic Italy to be deemed worthy of republication with a Latin Version, by the late celebrated Cardinal Mai, in his extensive undertaking, '*Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*,' in six

* British Quarterly Review, August, 1852.

large quarto volumes. The circumstance of the book having been published by Mr. Cureton in the Syriac only, without any translation, may in some measure account for its having been so little noticed at home. He has, however, prefixed an Introduction in English, of more than sixty pages, in which all the chronological information to be derived from these Letters is comprised; and he has collected many facts, never before brought together, relative to the origin of the Festal Letters in the Alexandrian Church. He has also added an interesting account respecting the collection of Syriac manuscripts among which this copy of the letters of the great champion of orthodoxy was found.

Nearly six years elapsed between the publication of Mr. Cureton's book and the reprint of it by the Cardinal Mai. We shall have a few remarks to make upon the manner in which his Eminence has made use of the labours of our countryman. The English translation, which appeared the year after the Cardinal's republication of the text, was made by the Rev. H. Burgess, but very carefully revised, corrected, and edited by the Rev. Henry Williams in the Library of Fathers of the Catholic Church.

The collection of Syriac manuscripts, in which these long-lost Epistles of the famous Patriarch of Alexandria were found, is altogether unrivalled by any other in the world, and it now forms one of the most valuable accessions to our national library which the Trustees of the British Museum, aided by the judicious liberality of her Majesty's Government, ever have been able to obtain. Some account of that part of this collection which was acquired through the intervention and exertions of Dr. Tattam, previously to the year 1845, has already appeared in the pages of a contemporary Review.* It excited very general interest throughout all Europe, and in the course of the same year was reproduced in the leading periodicals in almost every European language. No notice, however, of the acquisition of the remaining portion of this vast library has been brought before the public, except in the preface to Mr. Cureton's edition of these Festal Letters of Athanasius. We think, therefore, that we shall not be undertaking a task altogether unacceptable to our readers, if we present them with a succinct narrative of the acquisition of this wonderful library now belonging to the British nation, brought down to the present day.

The Syriac, as most of our readers are probably aware, was the vernacular language of the people of Palestine, at the time

of the coming of Jesus Christ, and that in which his ordinary discourses were delivered to his own disciples and to the crowds which followed him and listened to his teaching and exhortations. This is abundantly established, not only by the concurrent testimony of all historical documents, but also by the writings of the New Testament themselves. Besides retaining in the Greek the original idiom of the vernacular tongue to a great extent, they have also supplied several phrases exactly as they were spoken in the dialect of the country, and added at the same time an explanation of their meaning in Greek. Eusebius asserts that the Syriac was the only tongue which the Apostles understood when they were chosen by our Lord.* Nor can there be any just ground to question the universal consent of the earliest Christian tradition that St. Matthew wrote his Gospel in this language, which was spoken by his brethren and countrymen.

Joseph Simon Assemani, in his description of a manuscript transcribed A.D. 1531†, has extracted from the same a note of the colophon of a volume, from which it appears that at no very remote period there was existing in one of the churches at Bagdad a copy of a Gospel transcribed at Edessa, in the year of our era 78, by the hand of Achæus, the disciple of Addæus, one of the Seventy chosen by our Lord. At any rate it is certain that almost the whole of the New Testament was translated into Syriac at a very early period for the use of the churches in the East. About the year 300, we find Procopius‡, who was one of the most distinguished of the Martyrs of Palestine engaged in translating Greek works into Syriac. This task of translation, which probably was begun by others before his time, was certainly continued during the fourth century. There is now existing in the British Museum a volume, of which we shall speak more fully as we proceed, transcribed in the year of our Lord 411, containing a Syriac translation of two works by Eusebius, and also of the treatise against the Manichæans by his contemporary Titus, Bishop of Bostra or Bozra in Arabia, as well as of that ancient book attributed to Clement of Rome, called the Recognitions. Eusebius himself, Bishop of Cæsarea in Palestine, where was established a celebrated school of the Syrians, was also well acquainted with the dialect of the country in

* Γαλιλαίους ἄνδρας, εὐτελεῖς, ἀγροίκους, οὐδὲν πλέον τῆς Σύρων φωνῆς ἐπισταμένους : Theophania; in Cardinal Mai's *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, vol. iv. p. 118.

† *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana*, vol. ii. p. 486.

‡ Cited by Dr. Lee from Assemani, in the preface to his translation of the *Theophania* of Eusebius, p. xvi.

which he lived. In his explanations of passages of the Scriptures on several occasions he refers to the Syriac. In his *Ecclesiastical History* he inserts a long account relative to the conversion of Abgar, Toparch of Edessa, translated from the original Syriac document preserved in the archives of that city, and in his very learned *Preparatio Evangelica*, he has inserted a considerable extract of the *Treatise on Fate* by Bardesanes, written also in the same language about the middle of the second century. These are among the most ancient original Syriac works of which we have any information, and long since were supposed to have perished. They have however, we see, been discovered in this collection. The one has already been printed*, and the other is announced for publication by Mr. Cureton.

There were two famous schools in Palestine,—one at Cesarea, where Pamphilus, the friend of Origen and martyr for the cause of Christianity, established his celebrated library; and the other at Bethshan, Baisan, or Scythopolis, where Procopius, who also suffered martyrdom for the faith, carried on his literary labours of enriching the Syriac with translations from the Greek. But the largest and most famous academy of Aramaic learning was at Edessa, the ancient Ur of the Chaldees, and the modern Orfa: here, and at the monasteries in the neighbourhood, it was that several of the most ancient and valuable of the manuscripts now in the British Museum were transcribed. True indeed they were obtained immediately from the monks of the convent of St. Mary, named Deipara, or Mother of God, situated in the valley of the Ascetics, called thence Scete or Scithis, and also Nitria, from the Natron Lakes adjoining: but hither they had been brought originally from Mesopotamia, and had lain for 900 years after their migration, before they were transferred to a more accessible, and we will hope a more useful locality, in the centre of the British Metropolis. It appears from a passage of the famous Arabic historian of Egypt Macrizi, cited by Mr. Cureton in his preface to the *Festal Letters of Athanasius* †, that in the year 925 the Vezir Ali Ibn Isa Ibn Al-Jarrah arrived in Egypt, abolished several of the immunities which the Christian bishops and monks had previously been allowed to enjoy, and further imposed upon them certain taxes. In consequence of this proceeding, a deputation, of which Moses of Nisibis, at that

* In his '*Spicilegium Syriacum*,' containing remains of Bandesan Melito, Ambrose, and Mara Bar Serapion, now first edited, with English translation and notes, by the Rev. W. Cureton. 8vo. London: 1855.

† P. xxiv.

time superior of the Syrian Convent of St. Mary in the Valley of the Natron Lakes, was a member, was sent to the Court of Bagdad to lay their case before the Khalif, Al-Muetadir-Billah, and to petition that they might be still allowed the same privileges which they had ever enjoyed under the Moslem rule, even from the period of the conquest of Egypt by Omar. This Moses of Nisibis, who seems to have been both a learned man himself and a lover of books, turned his journey to a good account, and procured, during his sojourn in Mesopotamia, a great addition of literary treasures for the library of his own convent. He returned home with no less than 250 precious volumes—a very large number indeed of books for that period, many of which were even then of great antiquity. Doubtless he felt proud of having been enabled to confer so great a benefit upon the community over which he presided, as to have enriched their library to such an extent; and in order to preserve the memory of what he had effected, he took the pains of transcribing in many, perhaps in all, the volumes which he had been fortunate enough to obtain, a record of that event. There are at this moment in the British Museum a considerable number of manuscripts which still retain this inscription and, in all probability, in his own handwriting. It may not be uninteresting to insert here a translation of it, as it is supplied by Mr. Cureton.

‘“To the honour and glory and magnificence of this monastery of Deipara of the Syrians, of the Desert of Secte, Moses, mean and a sinner, the Abbot, who is called *of Nisibis*, gave diligence and acquired this book together with many others, two hundred and fifty; many of which he bought, and others were given to him as a blessing, when he went to Bagdad on account of this holy Desert, and of the monks who are in it. May God, for whose glory and for the benefit of those who read in them (he obtained the books), pardon him and the dead belonging to him, and every one who has been in communion with them. It is not permitted to any one by the living word of God, that he should act dishonestly with respect to any one of them, in any way whatever, nor appropriate them to himself. Neither that he should wipe out this memorial, or make any erasure, or cut or order another to do so, nor give them from this monastery. Whosoever dares to do this let him know that he is accursed. The books arrived with the above mentioned Abbot Moses, in the year of the Greeks 1243” (that is, A.D. 931.)’ (P. xxvi.)

We have no means of ascertaining what was the extent of the library of this convent of the Syrians, before the great addition made to it by the Abbot Moses. Besides the volumes which he obtained during his travels, he also caused others

to be transcribed within the walls of the convent.* After his decease, many other books were added, by the gift of individuals and from other sources, down to the 14th century of our era. The latest date of transcription of any volume mentioned by Mr. Cureton is A. D. 1292.† After that period, great ignorance seems to have prevailed among the good brethren of the convent. No attempt was made by them to increase their stock of books, either by the production of new works, or the transcription of old. It is certain, however, that in its most flourishing period this library of the Syrian convent must have been very extensive. There are now in the British Museum several hundreds of volumes which once belonged to it; and from these, which in many cases are made up of fragments of different works, it is evident that the number must have amounted to thousands, before neglect and ill-usage had injured and broken so many of them to pieces. Many, too, of the works contained in these manuscripts, and those alas! the most ancient and the most precious, were purposely erased by barbarous and ignorant hands to save the trouble or the expense of obtaining new materials for service books and legends of the saints, such as were in daily use in the church: this is shown by the vast number of Palimpsests of this class of books now existing in the collection. Besides the volumes which are in the British Museum, several others which once belonged to the same convent are now in the Vatican at Rome. It appears also that some have found their way to the Ambrosian library at Milan. A few are in the possession of the Hon. Robert Curzon, others have been scattered abroad in different parts of the East, as the fragments obtained by various travellers show -- and there may also be some still remaining in the convent itself, for many facts can be adduced to prove that the word of the monks, by which they have affirmed that they had delivered up all that they possessed, cannot in any way be relied upon.

The valley of the Natron Lakes, where the convent of the Syrians is situated, has been a favourite retreat of ascetics from the very earliest days of Christianity. During the persecutions to which the Christians were exposed from their pagan neighbours, about the middle of the second century, one Fronto withdrew to the solitudes of these lakes, in order that he might enjoy liberty of conscience with freedom from persecution amongst the arid sands of the Lybian waste. From that period, the number of those who retired from the world to devote themselves to the rigid duties of asceticism rapidly

See *Ibid.* p. xxiv.

† *Ibid.* p. xix.

increased, even after the decrees of Constantine had not only rescued Christians from persecution but raised them to honour. Ruffinus, who visited this valley of the ascetics about the year 372, speaks of fifty convents or tabernacles existing there at that period; and Palladius, who himself passed twelve months in the same place a few years later, informs us, that the number of devotees in the several convents amounted to five thousand. Among these convents was one especially belonging to the members of the Syrian churches, who spoke the Syriac language, which was dedicated to the Virgin Mary with the title of Mother of God. At what precise time this convent was founded or became exclusively attached to the Syrians, we have no means of ascertaining; but we have already seen that at the beginning of the tenth century it was held to be one of sufficient importance to entitle its Superior to be chosen a member of the deputation to the Court of Bagdad, and that he was personally possessed of sufficient influence to acquire during his journey, partly by presents, but mainly by purchase, no less than two hundred and fifty volumes even then of great antiquity and of immense value as well pecuniary as literary, and thus was enabled to enrich the library of the convent over which he presided, by so large and precious a treasure at one time. Neither have we any materials for the history of this convent subsequently, beyond certain notices in the inscriptions recording the donation of particular volumes to the Syrian convent, which are still found in the manuscripts now on the shelves of the British Museum. These notices mention the names of the various donors, and the number of the volumes presented by them, and often state who were the persons that occupied the chief offices in the convent at the several times when the books were offered. Macrizi, whom we have already cited, informs us that the number of convents in the valley of Scete or Nitria was once computed at a hundred, but that in his time, that is at the beginning of the 15th century, they were reduced to seven, one of which was the convent of the Syrians. In the 17th century, about the year 1678 or 1679, Robert Huntington, then British Chaplain at Aleppo, and afterwards successively Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, and Bishop of Raphoe, made a visit to this convent. This journey he undertook at the instigation of Dr. Fell, then Dean of Christ Church, and afterwards Bishop of Oxford, in the hope that he might be able to obtain there a copy of the Syriac version of the Epistles of Ignatius, to the existence of which attention had been drawn by Archbishop Ussher. His visit, however, proved unsuccessful. Probably he incautiously stated to the good brethren of the

convent the object of his coming; and certain it is that he could not have devised a more effectual method of frustrating it. It is quite evident that the monks concealed from him, or at least did not make known to him, the existence of their very extensive collection of Syriac books, which were, even then, useless to themselves and falling to decay. The only volume which Huntingdon mentions having seen in their possession, was an ancient copy of the Old Testament in the Estranghelo character.* The very work, however, which he had travelled so far in order to obtain existed then in their library in more copies than one. These have since been transferred to London, and have furnished in our time the means of testing more fully the whole of the Ignatian question, which in those days was so long and ably debated so far as the then known materials would admit.

At the beginning of the 18th century the existence of immense literary treasures in this Syrian convent was made known at Rome by one Gabriel Eva, a monk from Mount Lebanon; and Pope Clement XI., anxious to transfer the whole, or at least a part of them to Rome, to increase the riches of the Vatican, despatched Elias Assemani, cousin of the learned author of the '*Bibliotheca Orientalis*,' furnished with letters of recommendation to the Coptic Patriarch at Cairo, on a mission into Egypt, for the purpose of endeavouring to get possession of the library of the Syrian monks at Scete. His exertions were not altogether unsuccessful. He obtained between thirty and forty manuscripts, which had the misfortune to be upset as they passed down the Nile in a boat. They were, however, happily rescued from destruction in the water, and arrived safely in Rome without much damage, about the end of the year 1707. These upon examination proved to be so very favourable a sample of the rest, that the same Pope resolved to make still greater exertions to procure the whole; and commanded Joseph Simon Assemani to proceed to Egypt for this object. His attempts, however, were less successful than those of his cousin. He was well received by the fraternity of the convent, and allowed free access to all their books, from which he selected about a hundred of the most precious, hoping to be allowed to purchase them; but the monks, now made aware of the intrinsic worth of their collection, and probably attributing to it even a greater value than it possessed, from the desire which they now perceived the Court of Rome had to obtain it, refused to treat with him at all for the purchase,

* See Cureton's *Corpus Ignatianum*. Introduction, p. xxiv.

and he was compelled to be content with a very few books, which they at last consented to allow him to take. Several of those precious volumes, which he had selected to augment the stores of the Vatican, are now the property of the British nation; and still bear on them the marks of having been handled by that illustrious scholar and retain his handwriting. We learn from the Jesuit Claude Sicard, who visited the convent in 1712, that at that period the number of the Syriac monks did not exceed twelve or fifteen. Twenty years later, as we are informed by Granger, who spent some time in this convent, the books of the library were fast falling into decay, and were utterly useless to the monks, who were become altogether unable to read them. The church and buildings of the convent were also in a very dilapidated state, and the Patriarch had recommended the sale of their library as the means of obtaining resources for the reparation of the edifice. The good brethren, however, turned a deaf ear to his advice, and declared that they would rather choose to be buried in the ruins of their walls than to alienate the library which belonged to them. In 1799 there were eighteen members of this convent, as the General Andrésoy informs us. About seven years before this time they had been visited by one of our countrymen, Mr. W. G. Browne. He informs us that the Superior of the convent stated to him that they possessed at that time about eight hundred volumes; but that he positively refused to sell any or even to grant him permission to see them. In the year 1828 Lord Prudhoe, the present Duke of Northumberland, crossed the desert from the Nile to the Valley of the Natron Lakes, in the laudable endeavour to procure materials to assist the lexicographical and other labours of Archdeacon Tattam. He was fortunate enough to obtain several valuable Coptic manuscripts, which, with his usual kindness and liberality, he presented to Dr. Taftam.

In the year 1837, the Hon. Robert Curzon, Junior, was also a guest of the Syrian monks in the Nitrian convent, and had the good fortune to obtain several very valuable manuscripts, which have since changed their rough backs of wood and fetid rotten leather for fragrant russia, and have found a far more comfortable home than that of a sandy cellar teeming with vermin, on the shelves of his interesting library at Parham. Our readers are doubtless well acquainted with the graphic and vivid descriptions in his 'Visits to Monasteries in the Levant,' and we refer them to what he has to say himself respecting his visit to the Valley of the Natron Lakes.*

* Ch. viii.

The works which Lord Prudhoe had presented to Dr. Tattam very naturally excited in him the desire of obtaining still further aids for his Coptic labours, such as he doubted not might be procured from the same quarter. Encouraged by several persons of influence, among whom we would mention with honour the present Duke of Bedford, Dr. Tattam resolved to undertake a journey into Egypt himself, in quest of manuscripts. Accordingly in the year 1838, accompanied by Miss Platt, the accomplished daughter of Mrs. Tattam, he proceeded to Egypt, and, after some months' absence, returned to England with a considerable acquisition of manuscripts, obtained chiefly from the Syrian convent in the valley of the Natron Lakes. An interesting account of this expedition has been printed by Miss Platt, but not published, having been designed solely for private circulation.* The books which Dr. Tattam needed for his own works and researches were chiefly those in the Coptic language; the Syrian manuscripts, therefore, which he had been fortunate enough to acquire, being in no way requisite for his own labours, were disposed of by him to the Trustees of the British Museum, and consigned to the custody of the keepers of the manuscripts. A short examination sufficed to show their extreme value, not only on account of their very great antiquity, dating from the beginning of the fifth century downwards, but also from their contents. Besides works by original Syriac writers, of which no copies had hitherto reached Europe, they were found to comprise translations from the Greek made into Syriac at a very early period, touching closely upon the times when the authors themselves lived,—transcribed, too, some centuries before the earliest copies of the Greek now known to exist; and among them several versions of important works, of which the original Greek had been lost. Moreover it was evident from the note by the Abbot Moses, of which we have already spoken, found in several of the volumes, that there were still remaining within the convent about two hundred manuscripts, which must have been transcribed at the latest about 1000 years. There appears to have been no delay on the part of the keepers of the manuscripts in communicating these facts to the then governing body of the British Museum, nor any remissness on the part of the Trustees to adopt such measures as were requisite to endeavour to obtain the remainder of this most valuable and curious library. Mr. Cureton informa

* *Journal of a Tour through Egypt, the Peninsula of Sinai, and the Holy Land, in 1838, 1839.* Intended solely for private circulation. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1842.

us that the late Duke of Northumberland took the initiative in this matter at the Board, and we think it due to the memory of his Grace to mention this honourable fact. Application was accordingly made to the Lords of the Treasury for a special sum for this purpose, which was liberally granted; and Dr. Tattam, at the request of the Trustees, undertook another journey into Egypt, to endeavour to procure the remainder of the library of the Syrian Convent. Two hundred and seventeen precious volumes, with numerous loose quires, single leaves and fragments were the reward of his exertions. These arrived safely at the British Museum on the 1st of March, 1843.

It was supposed that the whole of the collection, which had so long been lying idle and mouldering to dust in a cellar of the convent of the Nitrian desert, had now been delivered up by their former owners the monks—at least they had given their word to that effect—and it was so stated to Dr. Tattam, who did not, upon this occasion, visit the convent himself, but employed native agents, whom he deemed likely to be more successful than himself, while he remained in a boat on the Nile, ready to receive the books upon their arrival. When they were delivered into his hands he could not help remarking that their bulk did not appear to him to be so great as when he had seen them lying in a heap in the convent on his former visit. The vendors, however, affirmed that they had left none behind, but faithfully brought all that they possessed. The sequel will show that the eye of our countryman was more correct and true than the tongue of the Asceatics.

It was among the volumes comprised in this second acquisition by Dr. Tattam, that Mr. Cureton discovered one of the copies of the Syriac version of the Three epistles of Ignatius; and also found among the loose quires and separate leaves, considerable fragments of the Festal or Paschal Letters of Athanasius, which are not known to exist in the original Greek, and had been supposed to have perished altogether in the lapse of ages, with the exception of a very few passages cited by Theodorus Balsamon and Cosmas Indicopleustes. Although these letters, thus discovered, were in a very imperfect state, Mr. Cureton thought that he should be rendering a service to literature and theology, by transcribing and publishing all the fragments which he had found of a work by so celebrated an author of which hitherto so little had been known. We will state in his own words the motive which led him to undertake this task, and give his own account of the means by which he was afterwards enabled to render it more complete. This will embrace a short history of the acquisition of the *third* portion

of this extraordinary collection of Syriac MSS., which has appeared in no other publication, and certainly seems to us to be sufficiently interesting to deserve to be more generally known.

‘Among other works which time and neglect had rendered imperfect, and left but fragments only of them remaining, I discovered a portion of the *Festal Letters of Athanasius*. . . . In these were comprised a part of the Introduction, the last part of the sixth and the first part of the seventh, together with a portion of the tenth and eleventh, the whole of the twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth Letters, and the first part of the twentieth. The fifteenth and sixteenth had been lost already, before the Epistles were collected together into one volume. Delighted at having recovered so much of a long series of official letters by one of the most celebrated bishops of Christian antiquity, whose genius has exercised an influence upon the Church for fifteen centuries, whose zeal and sufferings for the orthodox faith, and the stormy circumstances of the period at which he lived, must give an interest to every genuine line that has proceeded from his pen, I resolved at once to transcribe, translate, and publish the contents of these fragments, and to add also a few passages from other of his *Festal Letters*, which in the course of my reading I had observed cited by other authors, whose works were contained in the collection of Syriac MSS then in my hands. The transcript was made at such intervals of leisure as I could command, and the text committed to type in the spring of the year 1846.

‘At the time when this portion of the volume was printed, I did not venture to cherish the hope of ever recovering any other parts of the manuscript to which the fragments then in my hands belonged. I believed that the entire Syrian library of the monks of the convent of St. Mary Deipara had been removed; nor did I then suppose that these precious relics of the ancient learning of the oriental churches, which I was arranging with affectionate and reverential care in the British Metropolis, had left others of their fellows, not less venerable and equally precious, in the same degraded and neglected condition as they had occupied for centuries, in a miserable cell in one of the most lonely deserts of the world. So eminently successful had Dr. Tattam’s expedition been, that I could not hope for more success, and so abundant were the treasures with which he returned, that I naturally concluded the mine to be exhausted. The event has proved this conclusion to have been ill-founded.

‘Early in the year 1845, M. Auguste Pacho, a native of Alexandria and nephew of M. Jean Raimond Pacho, who has left behind him a considerable reputation by the posthumous publication of his travels in Africa, visited London in the hope of obtaining some confidential employment, for which his intimate knowledge of Oriental manners and customs rendered him admirably qualified. . . . After having remained a few months in this country, M. Pacho decided to return to his native country, Egypt. Upon his communicating to me this decision, I thought that a favourable opportunity was hereby pre-

sented of endeavouring to obtain additional treasures, which I doubted not may still be lurking in the Egyptian convents. I accordingly showed him the acquisitions which Dr. Tattam had made in Egypt, and entreated him to neglect no opportunity, which his residence in that country, and his knowledge of the language and customs of the natives might afford, to acquire ancient manuscripts; by which he would not only confer an essential benefit upon literature, but also might, if he were successful, render considerable and material service to himself: with this exhortation and my best wishes, I bade him farewell.'

Mr. Cureton received letters from M. Pachon on this subject once or twice in the course of the year 1846; and in July of 1847 he was delighted to learn that he had obtained nearly two hundred volumes, with many fragments and loose leaves, being a part of their library, which the monks of the Syrian convent of the Natron Lakes had concealed and kept back from Dr. Tattam at the time that they solemnly declared that they had made over to him all that they possessed. M. Pachon also stated his intention of sailing directly for London, with his newly acquired treasures, by the first packet from Alexandria. A few weeks later brought the news that M. Pachon had proceeded to Paris with the manuscripts; and, with a knowledge of the desire which the learned and zealous keepers of the Royal Library had to acquire new riches for their own institution, Mr. Cureton began to feel considerable anxiety as to the destination of the books which M. Pachon had obtained. Fortunately, however, by the judicious liberality of her Majesty's Government, which was never better exercised in the cause of literature than upon this occasion, the manuscripts were secured for the British nation, and became the property of the Trustees of the British Museum, on the 11th of November, 1847.

Mr. Cureton proceeds to give the following account of M. Pachon's acquisition:—

'After a few months' residence at Cairo, some circumstances transpired which induced him to believe that good faith had not been kept with Dr. Tattam by the Rais of the Monastery and Mohammed, a servant and interpreter, whom, in conjunction with the Shaikh of the village of Beni Salame on the border of the Nile, he had employed to negotiate the purchase of the entire library belonging to the monastery, but that a part of the volumes had been fraudulently retained, although the strongest asseverations had been made that the whole had been delivered up according to their agreement. With a most laudable intention M. Pachon determined to ascertain the truth of the matter, and to visit the habitation of the ascetics for that purpose. This resolution being once taken, was speedily put into execu-

tion, and he shortly afterwards found himself the guest of their dreary abode, and subject to all the inconveniences which their love of filth or hatred of cleanliness must necessarily impose.

‘It now became requisite for him to proceed with the greatest caution, if he wished to obtain any further tidings respecting their manuscripts. These ascetics of the desert had not dealt uprightly with Dr. Tattam; and they knew that any disclosure respecting the remainder of their library would at the same time make another disclosure not very creditable to themselves. Further: their superstitious fears and feelings had been wrought upon; for on the very day after they had delivered up their books and received the payment, they were deprived of the tenure of a tract of land on the borders of the Nile, which they held under the Pasha for the maintenance of their establishment. This loss they looked upon as a punishment sent from Heaven; not indeed on account of their having transgressed the heavenly laws in their dealings with Dr. Tattam, but on account of their having sold a part of the library belonging to their monastery; and they began to look forward with some degree of apprehension to the fulfilment of the solemn imprecations denounced by the various donors of the several volumes upon any who should dare to alienate them or remove them from the monastery—that their names may be blotted out of the Book of Life, and their portion and lot be cast with Pontius Pilate and Judas Iscariot. But these apprehensions shortly afterwards vanished, when another opportunity of obtaining money occurred.

‘For six weeks M. Pacho remained in the company of these inhabitants of the Valley of the Ascetics, at the end of which period he had so far gained their good will, that they ventured to show him the remainder of their library, and even to treat for the purchase of it. The terms of the bargain were soon concluded.

‘He now ascertained the extent of the fraud practised on the former occasion. Dr. Tattam had dispatched Mohammed for the purpose of negotiating through the intervention of the above-mentioned Shaikh the purchase of the library from the monks. He believed that the transaction would be more easily accomplished through these Orientals than if he were to appear in the business himself, especially as he must be compelled at last to rely upon Mohammed on account of his being unable to speak their language, which prevented him from having any direct communication either with the Shaikh, or with the monks themselves. The bargain was thus concluded for a certain sum to be paid for the entire collection. Dr. Tattam went himself with the money to the village of Beni Salame, whither the books were to be sent, and dispatched Mohammed with men and donkeys across the desert to convey them. When he arrived at the monastery the brethren felt some reluctance to give up their whole collection; separating therefore in a hasty and indiscriminate manner, not merely volumes but also quires and even leaves of the same volume, they divided the books into two heaps, and left it to Mohammed’s choice to select which he pleased. At the same time they stipulated that they should receive the whole amount that had been agreed upon, and left

it to him to represent to his employer that he had executed his task in obtaining the entire collection.

‘Dr. Tattam, who had inspected the library during his visit to the monastery in his first excursion into Egypt, upon receiving the portion chosen by Mohammed, at once declared his conviction that it did not comprise all the volumes which he had seen ; but so strong were the affirmations both of Mohammed and the Rais who had accompanied him with the books from Nitria to Beni Salame, that he was fain to acquiesce in their assurances. The sum agreed upon for the whole collection was accordingly paid. This amount Mohammed, the Rais, and the Shaikh divided into two parts,—one they distributed among themselves for their own private uses, and the other they sent to the monastery for the common purposes of the whole religious community. Much disappointment at first was expressed by the brethren when the Rais returned with only half the amount that they had hoped to receive ; but he soon silenced their murmurs by the justice of the observation, which he urged upon them, — that having themselves kept back half of the volumes, it was unreasonable for them to expect that the purchaser should remit to them more than half the sum which had been agreed upon for the whole collection.

‘Fully acquainted with the character of the parties whom he had to deal with, M. Pacho proceeded upon his business with all due caution. He superintended in person the packing of the books within the walls of the monastery : he caused every fragment, even the smallest that he could find, to be carefully collected ; and further, he offered a price varying according to the size for every quire, leaf, or even remnant of a leaf, which having been removed from the apartment where the rest of the books had been kept, might be discovered by any of the monks in their own cells, or in any other part of the building : having thus secured, as he believed, and as it seems most probable, almost every fragment that could still remain, he transported his acquisition across the desert to the Nile, and appointed Cairo as the place where the brethren were to meet him, and receive payment for their books. Part of the amount agreed upon was paid to them as soon as they arrived ; but M. Pacho still withheld for a time the remaining part, till he should receive ample assurance that the whole of the Syriac Manuscripts belonging to their library had been given up to him according to their agreement, and that none had been concealed and retained. He justified this method of proceeding to the monks who waited upon him for payment, by alleging their previous conduct with respect to Dr. Tattam ; and when at length, after some delay, he found that no more books were produced, he concluded that he had indeed obtained the whole of the remaining part of their library, since the anxiety of the good brethren to obtain the money was ineffectual to discover even any additional fragments. Before he ultimately delivered the whole of the amount into their hands, he required them to sign a document, by which they affirmed, that they had sold to him all their Syriac Manuscripts ; and that if any should be discovered in their monastery, or elsewhere in their possession at any period subsequent to the date thereof, they were to

become at once the property of M. Pacho, or of those to whom he should have transferred his right in this matter.' Further, to be still more secure, he required the Superior of the convent to publish a sentence of excommunication against any one of the brethren who should have withheld any part of this Syriac collection, and did not immediately deliver it over to the person to whom they had consigned all their interest in these manuscripts. He had perhaps discovered during his residence among the monks, that this precaution was not altogether needless. One of them, who had concealed a part of a book, was terrified by this denunciation, and forwarded it afterwards to M. Pacho, in time for him to receive it just before he left Egypt.

'Before quitting Cairo he received a visit from the above-mentioned Mohammed, who confessed to him that he had left behind in the monastery a portion of the library when he was in the employment of Dr. Tattam, and stated that he should be happy to devote his services to endeavour to obtain for him the remainder of the volumes, if he had any wish to procure them. M. Pacho gave him the best proof that he had no need of such services by taking him into the next room and showing him the books already in his possession.'

The manuscripts left the convent on the 31st of July, and arrived in London on the 12th of October. On the day after their arrival, Mr. Cureton went to inspect them. At the first view he writes : —

'I could almost have imagined that the same portion of the library which had been brought nearly five years previously by Dr. Tattam, was again before me in the same condition as I found it, when the books were first taken from the cases in which they had been packed ; as if the volumes had been stripped by magic of their russia, and clad in their original wooden binding, and the loose leaves and fragments, which had cost me many a toilsome day to collect and arrange, had been again torn asunder and scattered in almost endless confusion.'

Among these loose leaves and quires Mr. Cureton discovered several other parts of the volume in which the Festal Letters of Athanasius had been comprised, and was enabled to add to that which he had already printed the whole of the Introduction, the first five Epistles entire, and parts of the sixth, seventh, tenth, and eleventh, occupying fifty-six large octavo pages of the volume now before us. Another copy of the 'Three Epistles of Ignatius' also came in time to have the very few various readings in the text which it supplied inserted in the 'Corpus Ignatianum.' It was in this portion also that he found a palimpsest-volume, containing a large portion of the Iliad of Homer, which he ascribes to the fifth century.* This

* 'Fragments of the Iliad of Homer from a Syriac Palimpsest : ' edited by William Cureton, M.A. 4to. London : 1851.

he has subsequently edited in a magnificent volume, with beautiful fac-similes of the manuscript. The Trustees of the British Museum defrayed the expense of the publication. But by far the most curious discovery in the whole collection is that of a small fragment belonging to that very superb and ancient volume, of which we have spoken above, bearing the date of A.D. 411.

Some of our readers may perhaps be acquainted with the story of a very early edition of the Bible, in the Bodleian Library, if not from any other source, perhaps from the curious illustration which Mr. Sewell has employed in one of his published sermons. The volume in question was printed in the year 1462; and purchased for the University of Oxford, and located in the Bodleian Library on the 30th of August, 1750. It was then imperfect, a few leaves had been lost. In the year 1817, a large collection of MSS., formerly belonging to the Abbate Canonici at Venice, was bought by the Curators of the Bodleian Library; and the whole contents of the library, fragments and all, were carefully packed up and sent to Oxford. While superintending the unpacking of these, the present venerable and most respected librarian, Dr. Bandinel, with Dr. Cotton, then assistant librarian, discovered the lost leaves belonging to the above-mentioned volume among the fragments of this collection, and they were thus enabled to render almost complete a volume which had already been in the Bodleian sixty-seven years. The imperfect volume ended with the words of Psalm xxxvi. 9., 'quoniam apud te,' and the fragment, thus discovered, proceeded with the continuation, 'est fons vitæ.'

This is a curious and interesting account; but it is far surpassed by the history which Mr. Cureton supplies: we will give it in his own words:—

'Those who may have read an article in the CLIII. Number of the Quarterly Review, headed "British Museum:—Manuscripts from "the Egyptian Monasteries," will not have forgotten the interesting account furnished by the Hon. Robert Curzon, Jun., of his visit to the same convent in the year 1837, in which he states his regret at having been compelled to leave behind him a large imperfect quarto volume, which he recognised again a few years afterwards in my hands in the British Museum. This manuscript, with forty-eight others, was obtained by Dr. Tattam in his first excursion into Egypt in 1839.

'It is already famous among the learned of Europe, as containing a Syriac version of the "Theophania" of Eusebius, the original text of

which has been lost for ages*, but the work is now accessible to all by the labours of Dr. Samuel Lee, to whom we are indebted for an edition of the Syriac text, and likewise for a learned translation. This same precious volume contains also the work of Titus, Bishop of Bostra or Bozra, in Arabia, against the Manicheans; the Book of Eusebius upon the Martyrs of Palestine, and his Orations in praise of the Martyrs. The proximity of the time when this manuscript was transcribed to the period at which the two last-mentioned authors lived, within about seventy years of the date assigned to the death of Eusebius, and about forty years of that of Titus of Bostra, must of itself necessarily give great importance to a transcript of these works following so soon upon the times when they were composed. I believe there is no copy in existence of any other work of such antiquity that has been transcribed so near to the date of its original composition. Its value is enhanced still more by the fact, that the work of Titus, of which a considerable portion has been lost in the Greek, is found here complete; while that on the Martyrs of Palestine is exhibited in a more extended, and I believe in a more authentic form, than in the edition of the Greek, which is usually inserted in the eighth book of the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius.† When Dr. Lee published his edition of the Syriac text of the Theophania, in 1842, he expressed an opinion that the manuscript was probably not less than a thousand years old. He had not at that time discovered the transcript of a note of the date on the margin of one of the leaves which assigned to it an antiquity of nearly five additional centuries. This he afterwards found, and inserted it in the preface‡ to his translation of that work, which appeared two years later. This book had been entrusted by Dr. Tattam to Professor Lee for the purpose of enabling him to publish the Theophania soon after his first return from Egypt; and when the other volumes were delivered up to the Trustees of the British Museum, it was still allowed to remain in the hands of the learned professor, till he should have completed the important task upon which he was engaged. I did not therefore become acquainted with this manuscript until my experience, from having carefully examined and compared the rest, enabled me, from an inspection of the vellum, the colour of the ink, and the character of the writing, to form a tolerably accurate notion of its probable age. I had at that time in my hands a great number of volumes written at different places, and by various scribes, exhibiting a series of about sixty dated manuscripts, reaching from A. D. 1292 up to A. D. 464, of which twelve had been transcribed in

* The learned Cardinal Mai has since collected from various sources all the fragments known to remain of this work in Greek, and printed them in the fourth volume of his '*Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*.' 4to. Rome: 1847.

† We have seen a proof sheet of this work in the printer's hands, although we are not aware that Mr. Cureton has announced its forthcoming publication.

‡ P. xi.

the sixth century, the first A.D. 509: the last A.D. 600. I had thus ample means in the comparison of those which bore the record of their age, to form an estimate of the relative antiquity of such as had not been dated, or of which the note of their date had been lost: even a slight examination of this volume convinced me that it was the earliest that I had ever seen, and that I could not attribute to it an antiquity of less than about fifty or sixty years before the earliest dated manuscript that I had found in the whole collection. This would assign its transcription to about A.D. 414 or 404; a period so near to the time fixed by the note found in the margin, that I could not for a moment question either its genuineness or its accuracy.

‘I transcribe here this note as it is read on the margin of one of the leaves of that part of the volume which contains Eusebius’s treatise on the Martyrs of Palestine—fol 238. b.

We omit the text, and give only the translation:—

“Behold, my brethren, if it should happen that the end of this ancient book should be torn off and lost, together with the writer’s subscription and termination; it was written at the end of it, thus; viz. that: *this book was written at Orrhoa, a city of Mesopotamia, by the hand of a man named Jacob, in the year seven hundred and twenty-three; in the month Tishrin the latter it was completed.* And, agreeably to that which was written there I have written also here without addition. And what is here, I wrote in the year one thousand and three hundred and ninety-eight of the era of the Greeks.”

‘These dates reduced to our era give A.D. 411 for the time of the transcription of the volume, and A.D. 1086 for that of the note in the margin. I have not at this moment the means of ascertaining the name of the person to whom we are indebted for having taken this precaution to preserve the record of the date of this beautiful book, which, being at that time 675 years old, certainly deserved, even then, to be considered an “ancient book.” The fact, however, of his having made this note at all, seems to imply that even at that early period the books belonging to the monastery of the Syrians were already beginning to fall into a state of neglect; and that from the want of due care being taken to bind and repair them, the first and last leaves, or even quires, of some of them had already been lost. At a subsequent period this neglect became truly deplorable. In the whole collection, now in the British Museum, containing portions of considerably more than a thousand distinct volumes, certainly not fifty were found in a complete state upon their arrival, although much labour has subsequently succeeded in collecting and arranging the disjointed and scattered parts of many more.

‘Among those which had suffered was the inestimable volume of which I am speaking. The end of it, as the writer of the note anticipated, “had been torn off,” and the record of the date of its transcription lost. When Dr. Lee deposited the volume in the British Museum in 1843, I immediately began to search among the loose leaves and fragments of that portion of the library which Dr. Tattam had ob-

tained during his *second* excursion into Egypt, in the hope that I might perchance be able to discover "the end of that ancient book which had been torn off and lost." Although disappointed in this hope, I had nevertheless the satisfaction of finding a considerable part of two additional leaves of this manuscript, of which indeed every fragment is precious.

'When I first had the gratification of examining that portion of the library of the Nitrian monastery which arrived in England some years later, in 1847, I immediately recognised numerous fragments of volumes which were familiar to me, and not more than a few minutes passed before I had the pleasure of finding one entire leaf, and soon afterwards another, belonging to that precious book, the peculiarity of whose features was so strongly impressed upon my mind. This second leaf was not only complete in itself, but had also attached to it a small fragment of the corresponding leaf of the same quire, both of which had been formed of one piece of vellum of folio size folded into quarto. The back of this fragment I observed had been left blank. I thus ascertained that it must have belonged to the last page of the volume, and consequently to that which had contained the original subscription of Jacob the scribe of Orrhoa. I now felt that I might even venture to indulge the hope of finding the very subscription itself, and I anxiously looked forward to the time when I should have the opportunity of opening and examining, at leisure about twenty small bundles, which were pointed out to me, as containing fragments only of leaves which had been swept from the floor of the room in which the manuscripts had reposed for ages. Not many days later, when these with the rest of the collection were transferred to the British Museum, this opportunity was afforded me. One by one I untied the bundles and diligently and eagerly examined their contents. As I opened the fourth, I was delighted at recognising two pieces belonging to one of the leaves of this precious book; in the next I found a third. And now, reader, if thou hast any love for the records of antiquity; if thou feelest any kindred enthusiasm in such pursuits as these: if thou hast ever known the satisfaction of having a dim expectation gradually brightened into reality, and an anxious research rewarded with success—things that but rarely happen to us in this world of disappointment,—I leave it to thine own imagination to paint the sensations which I experienced at that moment when the loosing of the cord of the seventh bundle disclosed to my sight a small fragment of beautiful vellum in a well-known hand, on which I read the following words'—

We give only the English translation:—

"*There are completed in this volume three books—Titus, and Clement, and He of Casarea.*

"*Glory to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, now and at all times and for ever. Amen and Amen.*

"*This volume was completed in the month Tishrin the latter, in the year seven hundred and twenty-three, at Orrhoa, a city of Mesopotamia.*" (P. xxvi.)

‘No more indeed of this inscription remains,—but this was enough to repay me for the labour of my research, and to confirm and verify the facts connected with it.

‘The first of these sentences is written in red, the second in yellow, and the third in black.

‘Among all the curiosities of literature I know of none more remarkable than that of the fate of this matchless volume. Written in the country which was the birthplace of Abraham the Father of the Faithful, and the city whose king was the first sovereign that embraced Christianity, in the year of our Lord 411, it was at a subsequent period transported to the Valley of the Ascetics in Egypt, probably A.D. 931, when 250 volumes were collected by Moses of Nisibis during a visit to Bagdad, and presented by him on his return to the Monastery of St. Mary Deipara, over which he presided. In A.D. 1086, about 155 years later, some person with careful foresight, fearing lest the memorial of the transcription of so valuable, beautiful, and even at that remote period “so ancient a book” should be lost, in order to secure its preservation took the precaution to copy it into the body of the volume. At how much earlier a period, the fears which he anticipated became realised, I have no means of ascertaining, but in 1837, “the end of the volume” had been torn off, and in that state, in 1839, it was transferred from the solitude of the African desert to the most frequented city in the world. Three years later, two of its fragments followed the volume into England; and, in 1847, I had the gratification of recovering almost all that had been lost and of restoring to its place in this ancient book the transcriber’s own record of the termination of his labours, which, after various fortunes in Asia, Africa, and Europe, has already survived a period of ONE THOUSAND FOUR HUNDRED and THIRTY-SIX years.’

It will be seen, from the above account, that M. Pachó stated, that he had taken every precaution to secure the whole of the remainder of the library of the Syrian Convent, including even the very smallest fragments; and, in order to be more sure of this, that he had bound the monks, by a religious obligation as well as a civil contract, to deliver up to him for the amount which he had already paid, all books, loose leaves, or fragments whatsoever, if by any chance it should be discovered that there had been any still concealed and withheld. It is quite evident, however, that no inconsiderable part of the books had been retained by some one or other, for in the year 1850 M. Pachó again offered for purchase to the Trustees of the British Museum, nine volumes and a large number of loose quires and leaves belonging to this same collection. To the Trustees, indeed, these volumes and fragments were invaluable, inasmuch as they were necessary to make the collection itself more complete, and to render many volumes, which would otherwise have been defective, quite perfect. M.

Pacho was well aware of this fact, and the price which he demanded accordingly was excessive. Fortunately, however, on the other hand, these half volumes, separate quires, loose leaves and fragments were comparatively useless and valueless to any other institution than that over which the Trustees preside, and this consideration happily had the effect of enabling them to acquire this addition at a fair and equitable value, estimated according to the proportion of those which had been previously purchased. This last instalment was indeed of great value to the whole collection; for in it were found the beginnings and endings of several volumes now rendered quite complete. Amongst the fragments, two additional leaves of the Festal Letters of Athanasius were discovered.* Moreover, they were of much use in establishing the correctness of the data upon which Mr. Cureton had proceeded in assigning the approximate age of several manuscripts from which the record of the time of transcription had been severed. Numerous are the volumes to which he had attributed an approximate date, and printed the same in the annual Lists of Additions made to the department of Manuscripts, of which the notes of the time of their transcription, proving the accuracy of his calculations, were recovered in this last acquisition, obtained from M. Pacho subsequently to the period when Mr. Cureton had been called away from the British Museum to another sphere of duty.

Still it does not appear that the whole of this collection has yet reached Europe; for even as late as 1853, as we are informed, a few leaves belonging to these very books were obtained by a gentleman travelling in the East, and entrusted to Sir Frederick Madden's charge in the British Museum.

Having thus given a brief account of the acquisition of the library formerly belonging to the Syrian Convent in the valley of the Natron Lakes, in which the Festal or Paschal Letters of Athanasius, so long believed to be lost, were at length discovered, we will add a few words relative to the Letters themselves, and bring our remarks to a close.

The origin of Festal or Paschal Letters dates from the time of the Council of Nice. We will quote here Mr. Cureton's notice on this subject, without however giving the authorities which he cites. Those who wish for fuller information on this head we must refer to his book.

'Among the important matters discussed by the assembled bishops of Christendom at the Council of Nice, was the question respecting

* These have been printed by the Rev. H. G. Williams, at the end of the English translation of the Festal Letters edited by him.

the day on which Easter was to be celebrated. This was a subject which had been agitated not without great and bitter animosity even from the very infancy of the Church, and Constantine, anxious to remove for ever this cause of dissension, referred the matter to the grave decision of the first oecumenical council. This question therefore having been finally settled by the decision that Easter should be uniformly celebrated upon the first Lord's day after the Jewish Passover, agreeably to the custom of the Roman and other churches, the duty of determining accurately the day on which Easter was to be observed for the whole of Christendom was delegated to the Patriarch of Alexandria. To him alone it appears this office belonged, nor were the Bishops of Rome able to interfere at all in this matter, even although it should be proved certainly that the Alexandrian Bishops had made erroneous calculations and appointed the festival at an improper period. Upon such occasions, therefore, it was necessary for the Roman Bishops to appeal to the Emperor, and entreat him to admonish the Bishop of Alexandria to use more caution in determining the day of Easter, and thus preserve the whole of Christendom from falling into error on this head. Leo the Great furnishes us with an instance of this.

'The custom also obtained from the same period in the province of Egypt, that immediately after the festival of Epiphany, the Patriarch of Alexandria should send to all the towns and monasteries within his jurisdiction a notification of the day on which they were to commence the fast of Lent, as well as that on which they were to celebrate the festival of Easter. Such was the origin of Festal or Paschal Letters. The bearers of these letters, as it appears from Synesius of Cyrene, writing at the commencement of the fifth century, were well received in all the places to which they came, supplied with every thing that they needed, and furnished with fresh beasts to continue their journey.'

And the date of these letters, which amount to about forty-five in number, is satisfactorily traced to the middle of the fourth century, 326—370.

All these facts, as well as others supplied by Mr. Cureton, the learned Cardinal Mai has embodied in the preface to his edition or reprint of these Festal Letters; and he has referred to the original sources from which they have been derived, without, however, having once intimated that this information had been supplied by the original editor or any reference been made by him to those authorities which this Prince of the Church of Rome cites. True, he gives Mr. Cureton full credit for the discovery and publication of this long-lost work of Athanasius; but no one who had not seen Mr. Cureton's book would have been able to gather from the Cardinal's, that any of the information, which must have been culled at considerable pains, had been supplied by Mr. Cureton, or that his Eminence Mai had been at all indebted to him for indicating it. Professor Larsow is not

altogether free from the same imputation. He has, however, added a considerable amount of information from his own researches, and furnished a very accurate and correct translation. The same cannot be said, in every respect, of the Latin version of Cardinal Mai. Upon the whole, however, it represents the original sufficiently, and great praise is due to that very learned and laborious scholar—than whom not one in the whole College of Cardinals had so well earned the dignity and station to which he had risen—for having been able, under the circumstances, to present us with so faithful a translation. Ignorant of the Syriac himself, he was compelled to have recourse to the aid of an interpreter, and employed a Maronite Syrian, named Matthew Sciahuan, who translated the original into Italian, which formed the basis of the Cardinal's Latin version.

These Festal Letters vary considerably in length, according, as it would appear, to the ease or difficulty of the circumstances in which the author found himself at the times at which they were severally written. When the occasion was opportune, he did not fail to enlarge in them upon topics of doctrine and exhortation, and to supply information respecting the changes which had taken place in the several dioceses under the Patriarchate of Alexandria, from death or other causes. At other less favourable times, the Letters were much more brief, and confined chiefly to the main object for which they were designed,—that of giving notice of the day on which the ensuing festival of Easter was to be observed. Their chief merit is, however, their philological and chronological interest, which is perhaps enhanced in the eyes of Oriental scholars by the romantic circumstances of their preservation and acquisition by the British Museum.

ART. VII. — 1. *Letters of James Boswell, addressed to the Rev. W. J. Temple.* Now first published from the original MSS. With an Introduction and Notes. London: 1857.

2. *Boswelliana.* Printed for the Philobiblon Society, and comprised in the Second Volume of their Miscellanies. 1855–6.

3. *The Encyclopædia Britannica.* Eighth Edition. (Article *Johnson, Samuel.*) Edinburgh: 1856.

HOW capricious, as well as uncertain, is Fame—not the Fame commonly called Rumour, which was so mischievously busy with Dido's reputation, but that which is more favourably known under the popular *alias* of Celebrity! Like the wind,

a chartered libertine, it bloweth where it listeth. Like the mountain stream, it may foam and sparkle near its source, overflow its banks a little farther on, meander tranquilly and smoothly through the level country, and end by being dried up or by being collected in a clear placid lake. Like the river into which Dr. Johnson flung corks at Ashbourne, it sometimes sinks into the earth and is lost to sight at one place, to rise fresh and bubbling at another. A genuine coquette, it is frequently repelled by courtship, and attracted by indifference,—confounding calculation, baffling foresight, and by turns disappointing and transcending hope. It may be unexpectedly won by the indolent, almost unconscious, development of a familiar gift or faculty, whilst the strong will is vainly struggling for it by desperate efforts and extraordinary means. Many a famous name has been indebted for its brightest lustre to things which were flung off as a pastime or composed as an irksome duty, whilst the performances on which the author most relied or prided himself, have fallen still-born or been neglected by posterity. Thus Petrarch, who trusted to his Latin poems for immortality, mainly owes it to the Sonnets which he regarded as ephemeral displays of the feeling or fancy of the hour. Thus Chesterfield, the orator, the statesman, the Mæcenas and Petronius of his age, and (above all) the first viceroy who ventured on ‘justice to Ireland,’ is floated down to our times by his familiar letters to his son. Thus, Johnson, the Colossus of Literature, were he to look up or down (to adopt the more polite hypothesis), would hardly believe his eyes or ears, on finding that Bozzy, the snubbed and suppressed yet ever elastic and rebounding Bozzy, is the prop, the bulwark, the keystone, of his fame; ‘the salt which keeps it sweet, the vitality which preserves it from putrefaction.’

We may be grateful to the lexicographer, as we are grateful to Ainsworth or Lempriere; we may think of the critic as we think of Kames or Blair; nay, such is modern fatuity or insensibility, we might only remember ‘London,’ or ‘The Vanity of Human Wishes,’ as we remember ‘The Heroic Epistle’ or ‘The Triumphs of Temple;’ but the Johnsonian Talk, as recorded by confessedly the most instructive and entertaining of biographers, is still familiar in men’s minds as household words, and will carry to generations yet unborn the truest and deepest impression of the wisdom, wit, and learning of the speaker—of his goodness and rudeness, his piety and superstition, his weakness and his strength.

Dr. Johnson, writes Boswell, with reference to his proposed publication on their Scotch Tour, ‘does not seem very desirous

‘that I should publish my supplement. Between ourselves, he ‘is not apt to encourage me to share reputation with himself.’ If so, never were wishes more signally disappointed. Their names are now inseparably associated; and, if Boswell shines by a borrowed or reflected light, it is undeniable that the sun of his idolatry has been made continuously brighter through his instrumentality. Yet in proportion as the value of his labours has risen in universal recognition, has it become more and more the fashion to depreciate him. He is commonly mentioned as the ass laden with gold, although the slightest consideration might suggest that he must have selected the gold from amongst a confused heap of baser metal. In his case, the ordinary principles of human action are reversed. The editor, instead of constantly lauding the author whom he has volunteered to annotate, carps, sneers, and cavils. The biographer never lets slip an opportunity of asserting or insinuating that the life he is employed in detailing is that of a poor, vain, weak, and silly sensualist. Mr. Croker, perhaps, could not have adopted a more elevated or liberal tone had he attempted it; but why is the writer of the Introduction to the Letters hurried into a similar departure from time-honoured rules? As matters stand, poor Boswell is the very Pariah of literature. The most brilliant and impressive of modern historians has put forth all his strength to stigmatise him; and the only authoritative protest against the justice of the sentence, Mr. Carlyle’s, is qualified by expressions of contempt which render the apology little less damaging than the accusation.

When the Letters to Temple first saw the light, they were eagerly hailed and emulously quoted as irrefragable proofs of all that had been said or imagined against the luckless egotist. Will they, or should they, be so regarded on calmer consideration and inquiry? They undoubtedly furnish fresh and abundant proofs of the absurdity, the conceit, the profligacy, and the total absence of self-respect, which have made his name a name of reproach; but do they not also contain evidence of some nobler motives, and some higher faculties than Boswell has been allowed by his critics to possess? This is the problem which we invite our readers to discuss; and we may begin by dismissing all doubts of the authenticity of the documentary evidence before us. The story told in the Preface is certainly odd; indeed so odd, that one can hardly suppose it an invented one:—

‘A few years ago a clergyman having occasion to buy some small articles at the shop of Madame Noel, at Boulogne, observed that the paper in which they were wrapped was the fragment of an English

letter. Upon inspection, a date and some names were discovered; and further investigation proved that the piece of paper in question was part of a correspondence, carried on nearly a century before, between the Biographer of Dr. Samuel Johnson and his early friend, the Rev. William Johnson Temple. On making inquiry, it was ascertained that this piece of paper had been taken from a large parcel recently purchased from a hawker, who was in the habit of passing through Boulogne once or twice a year, for the purpose of supplying the different shops with paper. Beyond this no further information could be obtained. The whole contents of the parcel were immediately secured. The majority of the Letters bear the London and Devon post-marks, and are franked by well-known names of that period. Besides those written by Boswell which are here published, were found several from Mr. Nicholls, Mr. Claxton, and other persons alluded to in the following pages, as well as a few unfinished Sermons and Essays by Mr. Temple.

'At the death of the purchaser of these Letters they passed into the hands of a nephew, from whom the Editor obtained them; and in the present form they are now submitted to the Public.' (*Letters*, pp. v. vi.)

Mr. Hornby, who first undertook the editorship, has since (Jan. 6. 1857), written to the 'Times,' to state that 'clergy-man' is a misprint for 'gentleman'; that Madame Noel's customer was Major Stone, and the nephew, Mr. Augustus Boyse. On Temple's death, his papers came into the possession of his son-in-law, Mr. Powlett, who was residing in France. The most telling objection to Macpherson's good faith was his refusal to place the alleged originals of 'Ossian' in some public repository for inspection. Mr. Hornby prevents all doubts on this score, by announcing that the original letters may be seen at the publisher's. We have carefully inspected and collated them, and consider the chain of positive and external proof (so far as concerns handwriting, paper, post-marks, &c.), to be complete. But the internal evidence is enough to satisfy the most sceptical critic, provided he has been in the habit of reading the famous 'Life of Johnson' as a labour of love, and is thoroughly imbued with the modes of thinking and expression embalmed in it. No Chatterton or Ireland could have caught or imitated with such fidelity the distinctive traits of character and style; nor have invested a forgery so completely with the all-pervading tone, hue, and flavour of an original.

The Letters are well edited on the whole, although marks of haste (in consequence of the sudden change of editorship) are occasionally discernible. Thus, 'Duke of Bolton' is printed 'Duke of Breton' (p. 329.): 'downright Shippen' 'downright Skipper' (p. 182.): and 'The Cub' (the title of Boswell's

first production) is frequently printed *The Club*. To the list of Boswell's works (*Introd.* pp. xli. xlii.) should be added his Second Letter to the People of Scotland. Temple's Essays, supposed (pp. 239. *n.* 251. *n.*) to be lost or missing, have been discovered in the University Library at Cambridge; and his Essay on Dr. Johnson (the 'unknown publication' mentioned p. 405. *n.*) is in the British Museum. We see no reason for stating in the introductory remarks prefixed to each section of the correspondence, what is contained in the letters; and perhaps some of those remarks might be advantageously compressed in a corrected edition, which, we take for granted, will speedily appear.

'Boswelliana' is a contribution to the privately printed Miscellanies of the Philobiblon Society, from one of its most accomplished members, Mr. R. Monckton Milnes, who boldly dissents from the prevalent creed touching Boswell. By way of prefatory explanation, he writes:—

'The volume from which the following pages have been transcribed is, probably, one of many note-books left by the biographer of Johnson. It contains several sheets, filled with anecdotes and observations of the most various character, written without order, and generally without dates. At the end are inserted many scraps of paper and backs of letters, on which Boswell has jotted down memoranda of stories and reflections.

'These fragments seem to me to exhibit that analogy of character which especially fitted Boswell to be the friendly devotee and intellectual servitor of Dr. Johnson; nor can these resemblances of style and manner be regarded as mere parodies of his master, but rather as illustrating a mental harmony which enabled him to reproduce, with singular fidelity, his own ideal of all that was good and great.'

Mr. Milnes has placed this note-book in our hands, and the similarity of the handwriting, with various minor coincidences of date and incident, leave no doubt of its authenticity, besides confirming that of the Letters.

Many a man who has played a less important and less interesting part than Boswell, has been made the subject of a retrospective review; and we are disposed to think, that the best mode of turning to account the new materials afforded by the Letters and the 'Boswelliana,' will be to connect them with a sketch or outline of his career, availing ourselves, as we proceed, of the lights thrown upon it by the publications with which he favoured the world in his lifetime. Although most of these have long ago sunk into oblivion, they contain passages which may be appropriately introduced to support or demolish his claim to judgment and sagacity. We shall hardly be blamed

for wasting time or space upon him, when it is remembered how large a portion of the literary history of the eighteenth century rests upon his authority or is coloured by his pencil.

James Boswell was born in 1740. No one who ever heard of him, can have helped hearing that he was the son of a Scotch judge, Lord Auchinleck; and that both father and son were ostentatiously proud of their ancient blood. He was educated at Edinburgh under his father's eye; and never was there a more signal example of the difficulty of altering the inborn or ingrained tendencies of character. Whilst old Auchinleck was impressing the superiority of law-learning to every other sort of learning, and holding up a seat on the Scotch bench, combined with an hereditary lairdship, as the proudest object of human ambition, Jamie's thoughts were wandering to the English metropolis, and oddly divided between the anticipated pleasure of figuring at drawing-rooms in a gay uniform, and the yet more ardent hope of appearing before the republic of letters in print.

His first letter to Temple is dated Edinburgh, 29th July, 1758. What led to their intimacy is not stated. Temple, who eventually took orders, and became rector of Mamhead in Devonshire, was a Cantab, and had little in common with his friend, beyond a predilection for authorship. The early letters, although ending 'your affectionate friend,' began 'Dear Sir,' or 'My dear Sir,' and do not (at least those that have been preserved) warm into 'My dear Temple,' until 1761. Johnson told Boswell that he (the Doctor) had acquired the best part of his vast stock of learning at eighteen, and had added little to it at any subsequent period. Boswell might have replied, that he, on his side, had formed his peculiar tastes and habits at the same period of life; for in July, 1758, we find him seeking an introduction to David Hume, and simultaneously avowing a passion for a young lady whose name the Editor of the Letters, with all his diligence and sagacity, has been unable to unearth. In a letter, dated December, 1748, Boswell gives an account of his studies: 'From nine to ten I attend the law class; from ten to eleven study at home; and from one to two attend a college lecture upon Roman Antiquities; the afternoon and evening I likewise spend in study: I never walk except on Sundays.' Even at this early period, he had begun to cultivate the practice by which he was destined to become famous. 'During the vacancy in harvest,' he continues, 'I went along with my father to the Northern Circuit, and was so happy as to be in the same chaise as Sir David Dalrymple (Lord Hailes), the whole way. I kept an exact journal at the particular

'desire of my friend, Mr. Love, and sent it to him in sheets 'every post.' This Mr. Love was a player in Edinburgh, and his friend's master in English pronunciation. Boswell also called in the aid of 'old Mr. Sheridan,' to correct his Scotticisms, and succeeded so far as to extract (in 1772), from Dr. Johnson, the dubious compliment; 'Sir, your pronunciation is not offensive.' With this concession, he says, he was pretty well satisfied; and he recommends his countrymen to be content with attaining the same amount of proficiency as the Earl of Marchmont, who, being taken by a shopkeeper for an American, and asking why, received for answer, 'Because, Sir, you speak neither 'English nor Scotch, but something different from both, which 'I conclude is the language of America.'

There is an unlucky gap of nearly two years and a half towards the beginning of the Temple correspondence. The third letter is dated May 1st, 1761, and shows a decided change for the worse in our hero, who confesses his backslidings with his wonted frankness.

'I grant you that my behaviour has not been entirely as it ought to be. A young fellow whose happiness was always centered in London, who had at last got there, and had begun to taste its delights, who had got his mind filled with the most gay ideas, — getting into the Guards, being about Court, enjoying the happiness of the *beau monde* and the company of men of genius, in short everything that he could wish, — consider this poor fellow hauled away to the town of Edinburgh, obliged to conform to every Scotch custom or be laughed at, — "Will you hae some jeel? oh fie! oh fie!"'

The notion of getting into the Guards was rejected by his father, who was fortunately enabled, for once, to enlist filial vanity on the side of paternal authority. It is stated in 'Boswelliana,' that 'Boswell was presented to the Duke of 'Argyle, at Whitton, in the year 1760. The Duke talked some 'time with him, and was pleased, and seemed surprised that 'Boswell wanted to have a commission in the Guards. His 'Grace took Boswell's father aside, and said: 'My Lord, I like 'your son; that boy must not be shot at for three and sixpence 'a day.' Jamie had no inclination to be shot at for any amount of pay. The very best that could have been expected of him was, that he should behave like Basil Lee (the original of Sir Frizzle Pumpkin), who said he should have run away at Bunker's Hill, had he not been afraid of being shot by his own men. Boswell owns, in a printed address to his countrymen, that he 'is not blest with high heroic blood, but rather, I think, 'troubled with a natural timidity of personal danger, which it 'costs me some philosophy to overcome.'

There is an interval of more than two years between the letter to Temple last quoted and the next in the collection. But by way of compensation, we have the correspondence between Boswell and the Honourable Andrew Erskine (a gay bird of the same feather), which they were vain and absurd enough to publish in 1763. It is curious as showing what sort of publication was tolerated by a preceding generation; for it would appear that these youthful aspirants to the honours of Madame de Sévigné, whom they modestly proposed to themselves as their model, had no reason to be dissatisfied with their reception by the reviewers.

Amongst the 'Boswelliana' we find: 'A dull fool is nothing: the great thing is to have your fool well furnished with animal spirits and conceit, and he will display to you a rich fund of risibility.' This maxim is exactly applicable to the epistolary correspondence in question; except that its combination of dulness with forced or ill-timed merriment produces rather an impression of sadness than risibility. The memory of the colloquial wit and humour of this congenial pair rests on two or three conceits preserved in the same repository: 'Erskine and Boswell were one day sauntering in Leicester Fields, and talking of the famous scheme of squaring the circle; "Come, come," says Boswell, "let us circle the square, and that will be as good." So these two poets took a walk round the square, laughing heartily at the conceit.' They assumed the rank of poets on the strength of poems, or compositions in verse, entitled 'The Cub at Newmarket' by Boswell, and 'The Town Eclogues' by Erskine. The Cub is Boswell himself, who is sung as having been caught, domesticated, and introduced, by Lord Eglintoun. Yet the author could not have heard till long afterwards Johnson's remark that much might be made of a Scotchman if caught young.

Captain Erskine (we are quoting from the 'Boswelliana') complained that Boswell's hand was so large that his letters contained very little;—a complaint which, as regards the letters to the Captain, is not likely to be repeated by posterity — 'My lines,' replied Boswell; 'are like my ideas, very irregular, and at a great distance from each other.' In another of his self-accusatory reflections, after complaining that he had too good a memory in trifles which prevented his remembering things of consequence, he says happily enough, — 'My head is like a tavern, in which a club of low punch drinkers have taken up the room that might have been filled with lords that drink Burgundy; but it is not in the landlord's power to dispossess them.' The landlord, however, had two excellent opportunities, and partially

effected the desired clearance, in 1763; the year in which Boswell made the acquaintance of Dr. Johnson, and shaking off the habits of dissipation which formed to him the principal charm of metropolitan life at this period, departed for Utrecht with a firm resolution to pursue a course of study in keeping with the place. Their acquaintance commenced on the 16th May, under circumstances familiar to readers of the *Life*; and so rapidly did it ripen into cordial intimacy, that when Boswell started on his travels, Johnson insisted on seeing him set sail, and actually accompanied him in the stage coach to Harwich. One of their fellow passengers, a fat elderly gentlewoman, having stated that she had never suffered her children to be a moment idle, the following colloquy ensued:—Johnson: ‘I wish, Madam, you would educate me too; for I have been an idle fellow all my life.’ On her rejoining that she was sure he had not been idle, he resumed: ‘Nay, Madam, it is very true; and that gentleman there,’ pointing to Boswell, ‘has been idle. He was idle at Edinburgh; his father sent him to Glasgow, where he continued to be idle. He then went to London, where he has been very idle; and now he is going to Utrecht, where he will be as idle as ever.’

Many a true word spoken in jest. Boswell remained as idle as ever, although he managed to pick up at intervals a respectable stock of miscellaneous knowledge; and his distinguished friend is in no slight degree answerable for his want of regular application. In a letter written after their first supper at the ‘Mitre,’ he says, ‘Mr. Johnson was in vast good humour, and we had much conversation. I mentioned Fresnoy to him, but he advised me not to follow a plan, and he declared that he himself never followed one above two days. He advised me to read just as inclination prompted me, which alone, he said would do me any good; for I had better go into a company than read a set task.’ This advice is backed with a quotation from Shakspeare:—

‘No profit grows where is no pleasure ta’en.

In brief, Sir, study what you most affect.’

Yet it is bad advice, if understood as referring to the reading which is necessary for the completion of sound education, as well as to that which we pursue for amusement. For all purposes of study set tasks are indispensable; and Johnson leaves out of the account altogether the power of fixing the attention on uncongenial subjects, which is only to be acquired by habit. His doctrine, fatal to inferior minds, was obviously injurious to his own; for he had contracted an inveterate dislike to sustained intellectual exertion, wondered how any one could write

except for money, and never (or very rarely) wrote from any more elevated impulse than the stern pressure of want. By treading, *haud passibus æquis*, in his footsteps, Boswell fell into a desultory way of acquiring information without much mental schooling or training, and proved ultimately unable to adhere long to any profession, pursuit, or plan. 'Resolve, and keep your resolution; choose, and pursue your choice,' exclaims the same preceptor in the excellent letter which he wrote to his young admirer at Utrecht; but the evil genius proved the more powerful, and the decree had gone forth, 'Unstable as water, thou shalt not excel.'

We strongly suspect, however, that no amount of steady application would have secured for Boswell, with his order of abilities, the notoriety for which he panted and on which he stumbled in his wanderings. Restlessness and the love of excitement took him to Corsica, whilst Paoli's star was in the ascendant; and he contrived to associate his name as closely and as imperishably with that of the Republican chief as with that of the Tory lexicographer. Although he returned to England in 1766, his book, the fruit of his expedition, entitled 'An Account of Corsica, the Journal of a Tour to that Island, and Memoirs of Pascal Paoli' did not appear till 1768. On Feb. 1. 1767, he writes:— 'The session will be up this day sennight, I shall then set myself down to my account of Corsica, and finish it in the vacation. I have got more materials for it. I had some time ago a letter of three pages from my Lord Chatham.' This letter of three pages from 'the great commoner' might have been invited or provoked by one which Boswell addressed to him in the preceding June, concluding with a modest request that his lordship would be his occasional correspondent.

'As, for myself, to please a worthy and respected father, one of our Scots judges, I studied law, and am now fairly entered to the bar. I begin to like it; I can labour hard; I feel myself coming forward, and I hope to be useful to my country. *Could your Lordship honour me now and then with a letter?* I have been told how favourably your Lordship has spoken of me. To correspond with a Paoli and with a Chatham is enough to keep a young man ever ardent in the pursuit of virtuous fame.'

We shall presently see that the pursuit of virtuous fame was by no means the uppermost object in his thoughts at this epoch. Even the composition and revisal of his book were insufficient to fix his attention or steady his mind, and his anxiety for its completion only breaks forth at intervals. Hume the historian is described as thinking so well of the work as to have transacted the publication of it with Andrew Miller. This was in Febru-

ary 1767. In a letter of the following July we read: 'Mr. Dilly, bookseller in the Poultry, has purchased my Account of Corsica. I receive one hundred guineas three months after publication. I shall be close employed all this autumn in revising and correcting the proof sheets.' His expectations were fulfilled, and on Sept. 9. he writes: 'The proof sheets amuse me finely at breakfast. I cannot help hoping for some applause. You will be kind enough to communicate to me all that you hear, and to conceal from me all censure.' On second thoughts he goes on to qualify this somewhat contradictory request. 'I would not, however, dislike to hear impartial corrections; perhaps Mr. Gray may say something to you of it. The last part of my work, entitled the "Journal of a Tour to Corsica," is in my opinion the most valuable.' This is a remarkable instance of self-appreciation and sagacity, exerted under circumstances which have often misled or blunted the judgment of minds of the highest order. Boswell cannot but have felt that only a secondary description of renown was to be acquired by journalising, and that his literary rank, so far as concerned this book, must depend principally on the historical portion. Yet he instinctively anticipates and approves the decision of the public and of posterity, which disappointed the brightest and the most natural of his aspirations.

Johnson, Gray, and Walpole concur in praising the Journal. 'All that relates to Paoli,' writes Gray, 'pleased and moved me strangely. The title of this part of his (Boswell's) work is 'a Dialogue between a Green Goose and a Hero.' Yet the green goose played his part effectively. Indeed, there is no denying that Boswell possessed in an extraordinary degree the art of inducing men of eminence to talk freely with him, and even to treat him with confidence and consideration.

Whilst the book was in progress, Johnson encouraged Boswell to go on with it, saying: 'You cannot go to the bottom of the subject, but all that you tell us will be new to us. Give us as many anecdotes as you can.' Long before its completion, however, the sage grew tired of the subject. On one occasion he wrote: 'I wish you would empty your head of Corsica, which, I think, has filled it rather too long.' This was rather too much for Bozzy's docility. 'Empty my head of Corsica! empty it of honour; empty it of humanity; empty it of friendship; empty it of piety. No, whilst I live, Corsica, and the cause of the brave islanders, shall ever employ much of my attention, shall ever interest me in the sincerest manner.' Men of the world, with all who have no object beyond the play of mind and the interchange of thought in intellectual inter-

course, are little tolerant of those who are absorbed in any given pursuit, scheme, or subject, however philanthropical or praiseworthy their devotion to it. Tradition concurs with probability in assuring us that Howard and Clarkson were voted bores by the liveliest and cleverest of their contemporaries. We should, therefore, be inclined to back Boswell in his determination to stand by his brave islanders, had his zeal been restrained within rational limits, and been displayed in a manner to attract sympathy to their cause. Unluckily, it hurried him into vagaries, which could serve no purpose, beyond raising a laugh at his expense. It has been handed down as a well-known fact, that he appeared at the Shakspeare Jubilee, at Stratford-upon-Avon, with 'Corsica Boswell' inscribed upon his hat. This, Mr. Croker suggests, was probably his undress badge; for, 'The London Magazine' for September, 1769, contains a detailed account, supplied by himself, of his appearance at the Jubilee in the dress of a Corsican chief, with *Viva la Libertà* in gold letters on his cap.

Paoli, driven out of Corsica by the French, arrived in London towards the end of the year, and Boswell discovered it to be 'a duty as well as a pleasure to attend much upon him.' In fact, the distinguished exile lay under a solid obligation to Boswell, for Paoli's English honours and pension of 2000*l.* a-year were (as Temple states), mainly owing to the graphic record of his sayings and doings in 'Boswell's Journal,' and he was not ungrateful to his historiographer, who, on his part, accepted the proffered return without scruple or false modesty.

The three years immediately succeeding his return were busy years for Boswell. Besides paying assiduous court to Johnson and Paoli, he threw himself heart and soul into the Douglas cause, as a volunteer and unpaid advocate on what proved eventually the winning side; whilst he simultaneously made love, right and left, regularly and irregularly, with an audacious inconstancy, worthy of the Frenchman who justified a propensity to change by the plea: '*Mon Dieu, je change d'objet, mais la passion reste.*' We find him avowing, at eighteen, a 'passion' for Miss W——t. In Holland, he fell in love with the pretty and clever Dutchwoman, to whom he alludes in a letter of Feb. 1767:—

'Temple, will you allow me to marry a good Scots lass? ha! ha! ha! What shall I tell you? Zelide has been in London this winter. I never hear from her,—she is a strange creature. Sir John Pringle attended her as a physician. He wrote to my father: "She has too much vivacity; she talks of your son without either resentment or attachment." Her brothers and I correspond; but I am well rid of

her. You say well, that I find mistresses wherever I am; but I am a sad dupe,—a perfect Don Quixote.'

The Scots lass is no abstraction. He has one of flesh and blood, of acres and good connexions, in his eye. There was a young lady,—he states in his next letter,—in the neighbourhood of Auchinleck, who had an estate of her own, 'just eighteen, a genteel person, an agreeable face, of a good family, sensible, good-tempered, cheerful, pious.'

'You know my grand object is the ancient family of Auchinleck, —a venerable and noble principle. How would it do to conclude an alliance with the neighbouring princess, and add her lands to our dominions?'

The princess not having manifested a corresponding ardour to meet the wishes of the prince, Temple is adjured to hasten to the assistance of his friend and undertake a mission to the obdurate beauty, in the hope of softening her heart, or removing her objections to the alliance. Written instructions for his guidance throughout this delicate affair were forwarded to him, and the leading articles were to this effect:—

'*Wednesday.*—Breakfast at eight; set out at nine; Thomas will bring you to Adamtown a little after eleven. Send up your name; if possible, put up your horses there, they can have cut grass; if not, Thomas will take them to Mountain, a place a mile off, and come back and wait at dinner. Give Miss Blair my letter. Salute her and her mother; ask to walk. See the place fully; think what improvements should be made. Talk of my mare, the purse, the chocolate. Tell, you are my very old and intimate friend. Praise me for my good qualities,—you know them; but talk also how odd, how inconstant, how impetuous, how much accustomed to women of intrigue. Ask gravely, Pray don't you imagine there is something of madness in that family? Talk of my various travels,—German princes,—Voltaire and Rousseau. Talk of my father; my strong desire to have my own house. Observe her well. See, how amiable! Judge if she would be happy with your friend. Think of me as the great man at Adamtown—quite classical too! Study the mother. Remember well what passes. Stay ten. At six, order horses and go to New Mills, two miles from Loudoun; but if they press you to stay all night, do it. Be a man of as much ease as possible. Consider what a romantic expedition you are on; take notes; perhaps you now fix me for life.

'*Thursday.*—Return to Glasgow from New Mills or from Adamtown. See High Church, New Church College, and particularly the paintings, and put half-a-crown into the box at the door. My friend, Mr. Robert Fowles, will show you all.

'*Friday.*—Come back in the fly. Bring your portmanteau here. We shall settle where you are to lodge.'

'N.B.—You are to keep an exact account of your charges.'

A document of this kind defies comment. In its ludicrous minuteness it stamps character, as a photographic drawing brings out a face with its harsh lines and wrinkles, or a building with its cracks and weather stains. Temple's intercession, and haply the temptation of becoming Lady of Auchinleck, gained Boswell more than one good opportunity of pressing his suit. In a letter, dated from Adamtown, Miss Blair's residence, he says : ' At last I'm here, and our meeting has been such as you paint ' in your last but one. I have been here but one night; she insisted on my staying another; I am dressed in green and gold; ' I have my chaise, in which I sit alone, like Mr. Gray, and ' Thomas rides by me in a claret-coloured suit with a silver-laced ' hat.' She refuses a lock of her hair, but is escorted by him to the Edinburgh Theatre, to see Othello. ' I sat close behind the ' princess, and at the most affecting scenes, I pressed my hand ' upon her waist: she was in tears, and rather leaned to me.' The same letter contains a report of the dialogue which gave the *coup de grace* to his hopes.

' *Princess.* — I really have no particular liking for you: I like many people as well as you.

' *Boswell.* — Do you indeed? Well, I cannot help it; I am obliged to you for telling me so in time. I am sorry for it.

' *Princess.* — I like Jeany Maxwell (Duchess of Gordon) better than you.

' *B.* — Very well; but do you like no man better than me?

' *P.* — No.

' *B.* — Is it possible that you may like me better than other men?

' *P.* — I don't know what is possible.

' *B.* — You are very fond of Auchinleck, that is one good circumstance.

' *P.* — I confess I am. I wish I liked you as well as I do Auchinleck.'

We recommend the example of this Scots lass to the serious consideration of the unmarried portion of the fair sex. The candid avowal of a liking for the estate rather than for the owner would prevent frequent disappointment, and might avert an infinity of harm. Most princes would have given over the pursuit of the most attractive of princesses after such a reception, but Boswell is not yet satisfied, and goes on courting rebuff after rebuff. At length, about two months after this dialogue, he announces the formal abandonment of his pretensions, remarking: ' What amazed me was, that she and I were as easy ' and good friends as ever.' The lady might have cleared up the mystery for him pretty nearly as Madame du Deffand solved the problem why she and her president had never once quarrelled during a fifty years' intimacy: ' Is it not that we have been

‘completely indifferent to one another the whole time?’ Boswell adds, ‘I told her I have great animal spirits and bear it wonderfully well. But this is really hard: I am thrown upon the wide world again; I don’t know what will become of me.’ Three days afterwards (Feb. 11.), an entire change has come over the spirit of his dream. ‘The heiress is a good Scots lass, but I must have an English woman. My mind is now twice as enlarged as it has been for some months. You cannot say how fine a woman I may marry, perhaps a Howard or some other of the noblest in the kingdom.’ In his vocabulary *fine* is a collective term meaning everything desirable in a woman or a wife. By the 24th March, his fancy is on the wing for Holland. ‘Do you know, my charming Dutchwoman and I have renewed our correspondence? and upon my soul, Temple, I must have her.’ Both friend and father declare that he must not, and he acquiesces with a protest. ‘I cannot help thinking both my father and friend too severe. Zelide may have had faults, but is she always to have them? May not time have altered her for the better as it has altered me?’ After recapitulating in a suppressed passage circumstances proving that he is in no respect altered for the better, he offers a compromise: ‘P.S. I know you are determined to have me married. What would you think of the fine, healthy, young, amiable Miss Dick, with whom you dined so agreeably? Would not the worthy knight call out a homily? She wants only a good fortune.’

Lest the Emerald Isle should be jealous, we must not forget to state that one of her daughters was first favourite for a time.

‘I am exceedingly lucky in having escaped the insensible Miss B. and the furious Zelide, for I have now seen the finest creature that ever was formed; *la belle Irlandaise*. Figure to yourself, Temple, a young lady just sixteen, formed like a Grecian nymph, with the sweetest countenance, full of sensibility, accomplished, with a Dublin education, always half the year in the north of Ireland, her father a counsellor-at-law, with an estate of 1000*l.* a year, and above 10,000*l.* in ready money.’

Interspersed and concurrent with these matrimonial schemes are connections and adventures of a very different description. His revelations to his reverend friend, and his vows of amendment so long as he is suffering from the consequences of his irregularities, are in the tone and style of a Spanish or Italian woman of gallantry, who periodically confesses the same weakness, and obtains absolution by the same vow of repentance and amendment. The editor of the Letters has exercised some discretion in suppressing a portion of these disclosures, but more than enough remains to give a strange picture of the

amusements of Boswell, and of the manners of the last century.

After long wavering between England, Scotland, Ireland, and Holland, Boswell at length made up his mind to fling the handkerchief to a country woman. In the autumn of 1769, he married Miss Margaret Montgomerie, of the noble house of Eglinton, a lady whose chief, if not sole, fault in the eyes of her husband was that she could never abide Johnson, although she did her best to be civil to him as a guest. He was well aware of her antipathy, and frequently alludes to it. His opinion of her, therefore, as expressed in a letter to Mrs. Thrale, must be taken with some grains of allowance, for even philosophers are not proof against prejudice when their personal merits are impugned. He describes her as having 'the mien and manners of a gentlewoman, and such a person and mind as would not in any place either be admired or condemned. She is in a proper degree inferior to her husband; she cannot rival him, nor can he ever be ashamed of her.' Such was Boswell's respect for her sagacity, or his fondness for note-taking, that he kept a record of her sayings, entitled 'Uxoriana,' which may be read in 'Boswelliana,' but are hardly worth extracting. The same valuable repository contains an anecdote which may enable us to judge to what extent his vagrant affections had been fixed by matrimony:—

'The Honorable Mrs. Stuart, in a pretty, expressive manner, told me, that she had fairly asked a respectable friend, if he had ever been unfaithful to his wife, and that he answered, "No! madam, never; I must not allow myself to run any risk of liking another woman better than my wife." This she told me as an instance of exemplary fidelity, not without a sly reference to the licenses of her husband, the Colonel, and myself. I turned it off, I think, with a pretty ingenious readiness. Said I, "He has not been so certain of loving his wife as some others of us; we are so conscious of inviolable affection and regard, that we are not afraid of little risks."'

This Mrs. Stuart, with her pretty, expressive manner, was one of the 'little risks' to which he exposed himself as fearlessly and (according to his own account) with as little injury to his morals, as a hermit or a saint.

'I passed a delightful day yesterday. After breakfasting with Paoli, and worshipping at St. Paul's, I dined *tête-à-tête* with my charming Mrs. Stuart, of whom you have read in my journal; she refused to be of a party at Richmond, that she and I might enjoy a farewell interview. We dined in all the elegance of two courses and a dessert, with dumb-waiters, except when the second course and the dessert were served. We talked with unreserved freedom, as we had nothing to fear; we were *philosophical*, upon honour,—not deep, but feeling; we were pious; we drank tea, and bid each other adieu

as finely as romance paints. She is my wife's dearest friend; so you see how beautiful our intimacy is.'

About a year afterwards (May, 1776), he says:—

'My intimacy with Mrs. Stuart is friendship, sister indeed to Love, but such as I can never look foolish when her husband comes in, who perfectly understands us, and is happy that she is agreeably entertained when he is at his clubs.'

An anecdote from '*Boswelliana*' will, at all events, acquit Boswell of all underhand proceedings in this affair, unless he should be suspected of a refinement of treachery worthy of Lovelace:—

'Lord Mountstuart said it was observed, I was like Charles Fox. "I have been told so," said I. "You're much uglier," said Colonel James Stuart, with his sly drollery. I turned to him full as sly, and as droll, "Does your wife think so, Colonel James?" Young Burke said, "Here there was less meant than meets the ear!"'

His wife died in 1789, and her death removed a useful check on his irregularities, besides embittering his despondency with remorse. Yet he was incapable of behaving with deliberate unkindness to any one, and he uniformly speaks of her with pride and affection, although the difference in their dispositions is constantly present to his mind. 'How different,' he writes from London shortly before her death, 'are she and I. I was 'the great man' (as we used to say), at the late drawing-room, in a suit of imperial blue, lined with rose-coloured silk, and ornamented with rich gold-wrought buttons. What a motley scene in life!'

One of his best sayings was elicited by a conjugal difference:—

'When I was warm, talking of my own consequence and generosity, my wife made some cool, humbling remark upon me. I flew into a violent passion; I said, "If you throw cold water upon a plate of iron much heated, it will crack to shivers."'

The page in the '*Marriage of Figaro*' complains that his heart is thrown into a flutter by the mere sight of a petticoat:—

'That garment of a mystical sublimity,
No matter whether satin, silk, or dimity.'

Boswell continued to resemble Cherubino long after the age at which any plausible excuse could be suggested for the frailty. He writes from Grantham, March 1775, six years after marriage:—

'I am in charming health and spirits. There is a handsome maid

at this inn, who interrupts me by coming sometimes into the room. I have no confession to make, my priest; so be not curious.'

The very letter (dated Grantham, May, 1775), in which he describes his farewell dinner with Mrs. Stuart, begins with one instance of levity, and ends with another:—

'Here I am again on my return from London, in almost as good spirits as when I wrote to you on my way to that metropolis; but the handsome chambermaid is gone from the inn, and I have the prospect of seeing my excellent wife very soon.'

'There is a Miss Silvertown in the Fly with me, an amiable creature, who has been in France. I can unite little fondnesses with perfect conjugal love. Remember to put my letters in a book neatly; see which of us does it first.'

On his way from Grantham northwards, he has another flattering adventure, on which he generalises:—

'I got into the fly at Buckden, and had a very good journey. An agreeable young widow nursed me, and supported my lame foot on her knee. Am I not fortunate in having something about me that interests most people at first sight in my favour?'

In his 'Tour to the Hebrides,' which was revised by Dr. Johnson, he thus records an indelible reminiscence of Inverary Castle:—

'We were shown through the house; and I shall never forget the impression made upon my fancy by some of the ladies maids, tripping about in neat morning dresses. After seeing for a long time little but rusticity, their lively manner, and gay, inviting appearance, pleased me so much, that I thought for the moment I could have been a knight-errant for them.'

The frankness of Boswell's avowals on this delicate subject will remind the reader of Pepys', who carefully notes down in his Diary, how he kissed a pretty actress in his wife's presence without exciting her jealousy; and how his sleep was troubled by visions of the court beauties, after seeing them toy and flirt with the gallants at Whitehall. But 'set a thief to catch a thief;' had Boswell been made of sterner or harder stuff, he would have flung a mantle over his illustrious friend, when yielding, or afraid or suspected of yielding, to a similar temptation. We might have lost Johnson's excuse for not renewing his visit to the green-room on Garrick's invitation; Wilkes' roguish remark on the Doctor's mode of regarding the fair Quaker at Dilly's; and the capital sketch of him at Sky, with 'one of our married ladies, a 'lively, pretty little woman, upon his knee,'—thus versified by Peter Pindar:—

'Methinks the Caledonian dame I see,
Familiar sitting on the Rambler's knee,

Charming, with kisses sweet, the chuckling sage,
 Melting, with sweetest smiles, the frost of age;
 "Do it again, my dear," I hear Sam cry;
 "See who first tires, my charmer, you or I."

In one of his more rational moods, Boswell looks forward to marriage as an infallible cure for unsettled habits, as well as for promiscuous gallantry. The prescription utterly failed in both respects. He neither, as we have seen, limited his amatory and sentimental attentions to his wife, nor did he contentedly settle down as a practising advocate in Edinburgh. His hopes and fears, his exertions and his interests, were constantly divided and distracted between four or five incompatible objects or pursuits. One while he expatiates exultingly on his former prospects: then he is to acquire fame and fortune by his pen, and directly afterwards we find him confidently relying on political advancement through a patron. In the same letter in which he talks of appearing before the General Assembly to answer Hume and Robertson, he exclaims; 'If Lord Mountstuart would but get me an independency from the King, whilst my father lives, I should be a fine fellow.' His estimate of his own merits is still more pointedly expressed in the 'Boswelliana': —

'Talking of myself to Abbate Cotti, a Corsican priest, and regretting that the King had not yet promoted me, I said, "*Monsieur, il ne me manque que la base. Je suis déjà la statue.*"'

At a later period, he had founded some expectations upon Pitt.

'The excellent Langton says it is disgraceful; it is utter folly in Pitt not to reward and attach to his administration a man of my popular and pleasant talents, whose merit he has acknowledged in a letter under his own hand. I lately wrote to him that such behaviour to me was certainly not generous. I think it is not just, and (forgive the freedom), I doubt if it be wise. . . . About two months have elapsed, and he has made no sign. How can I still delude myself with dreams of rising in the great world?'

The delusion was kept up till it was rudely dissipated by the nobleman, Lord Lonsdale, whom he had selected for his patron-in-chief, on apparently very slender grounds.

The Dean of St. Patrick says, in the 'Journal to Stella,' 'I never knew a ministry do anything for those whom they make companions of their pleasures.' They rarely do much for those whom they respect so little as to allow practical jokes to be played upon them, or with whom they have no tie beyond boon companionship. During a visit to Lowther Castle, Boswell's wig was abstracted for the amusement of the company; and in June 1790, he came to a downright quarrel with his

lordship, who began, 'I suppose you thought I was to bring you into Parliament? I never had any such intention.' In the ensuing altercation Boswell says: 'I used such expressions as irritated him almost to fury; so that he used such expressions towards me that I should have, according to the irrational laws of honour sanctioned by the world, been under the necessity of risking my life, had not an explanation taken place.'

Thus roughly awakened from his day dreams of preferment through patronage, he fell back despondingly upon law and literature. We read in the 'Boswelliana': 'I always wished to go to the English bar. When I found I could labour, I said it was a pity to dig in a lead mine when I could get to a gold one.' When his father's death left him free to gratify this wish, the result did not answer his expectations, either as regards briefs or society. He got little or no business, and was unmercifully quizzed on the Northern Circuit, which he joined first. In February, 1789, he writes: 'I hesitate as to going the Spring Northern Circuit, which costs fifty pounds, and obliges me to be in rough unpleasant company four weeks.' When Flood failed in the British Parliament, Curran remarked that an oak of the forest could not be transplanted at fifty. This is equally true (or truer) of an inferior quality of tree. Boswell was past middle life when he began to practise at the English bar; and the notoriety he had acquired in other pursuits, with the habits and modes of thinking he had contracted in them, proved insuperable obstacles to his success. English attorneys were not likely to seek out a Scotchman who had placarded himself as Corsican Boswell; whilst confirmed sobriety of demeanour and regularity of conduct could alone have put him at his ease, or have enabled him to live without discomfort amongst the younger members of the profession, the section to which, by his short standing and his briefless state, he was necessarily attached. But, even with a lad like Temple's brother, he could not keep up his dignity; and the worst circuit joke played upon him arose out of his inebriety. The story is told in Lord Eldon's anecdote book.

'At an assizes at Lancaster, we found Dr. Johnson's friend, Jemmy Boswell, lying upon the pavement, *inebriated*. We subscribed at supper, a guinea for him, and half-a-crown for his clerk; and sent him, when he waked next morning, a brief, with instructions to move, for what we denominated, the writ of "*Quare adhæsit pavimento*," with observations duly calculated to induce him to think that it required great learning to explain the necessity of granting it to the judge.

before whom he was to move. Boswell sent all round the town to attorneys, for books that might enable him to distinguish himself, but in vain. He moved, however, for the writ, making the best use he could of the observations in the brief. The judge was perfectly astonished, and the audience amazed. The judge said, "I never heard of such a writ; what can it be that adheres *pavimento*? Are any of you gentlemen at the bar able to explain this?" The Bar laughed. At last one of them said, "My lord, Mr. Boswell, last night, *adhæsit pavimento*. There was no moving him for some time. At last, he was carried to bed, and he has been dreaming about himself and the pavement."

We suspect that Lord Eldon set down this anecdote from hearsay, and added or coloured some of the details; for it is difficult to suppose that the Bar would have suffered the joke to be carried such lengths, or have permitted such a ruinous self-exposure, had the victim been ever so willing.

One of the social problems submitted to Johnson was, whether a barrister might properly solicit employment. The Doctor responds that he sees no harm in it, although he would disdain to do so himself. Boswell, preferring the sage's theory to what might have been his practice, writes to his friend George Dempster in 1791: 'When it (the Life) is fairly launched, I mean to stick close to Westminster Hall, and it will be truly kind if you recommend me appeals or causes of any sort.'

The year following he left the Northern Circuit for the Home, which he found much more pleasant, although he did not get a single brief; and the editor endeavours to account for the fact by supposing some inherent difference as regards gravity, decorum, and sobriety, between the two august bodies thus forced into invidious contrast. He forgets that Boswell had undergone a severe training, and that the reception of his 'Life of Johnson,' published in the spring of 1791, besides raising his spirits and adding to his self-complacency, had given him a more legitimate title to the consideration which he claimed.

The manner in which his mind alternated between hope and fear, exultation and despondency, during the composition of this book, is strikingly shown in the 'Letters.' From his correspondence with Malone, it appears that he hesitated whether he should accept an offer of 1000 guineas for the copyright, and that he was much in want of money. 'Could I indeed raise 1000*l.* upon the credit of the work, I should incline to game, as Sir Joshua says; because it may produce double the money, though Steevens kindly tells me that I have over-printed, and that the curiosity about Johnson is now only in our own circle.' Steevens was wrong, or Boswell

created the taste which he gratified, for the book^{*} speedily rose into the popularity which it still retains. In August, about three months after the publication, he writes; 'My *magnum opus* tells wonderfully; 1200 are now gone, and we hope the whole 1700 must be gone before Christmas.' In the advertisement to the second edition, which was published in July, 1793, with eight sheets of additional matter, Boswell delightedly proclaims: 'An honourable and revered friend, speaking of the favourable reception of my volumes, even in the circles of fashion and elegance, said to me, "You have made them all talk Johnson." Yes, I may add, I have *Johnsonised* the land; and I trust they will not only talk but think *Johnson*.'

In 'Green's Diary,' it is stated, that Sir James Mackintosh spoke highly of Johnson's prompt and vigorous powers in conversation, and, on this ground, of Boswell's Life of him. Burke, he said, agreed with him, and affirmed that this work was a greater monument to Johnson's fame than all his writings put together.' Allowing for its influence in attracting attention to his writings, the 'Life' may certainly be described as the greatest monument to his fame. It was so regarded by the most distinguished of his contemporaries, and (what would most especially have delighted the author had he lived to see it) the rival collectors of 'Johnsoniana' rarely see the light except in the ignominious position of his appendages, dragged along in his wake or tacked to his tail. His success, with all its drawbacks, was quite enough at starting to have made him happy, had he retained his pristine buoyancy and hopefulness of spirit; but he had no longer strength of mind to shake off his now confirmed habit of flying to the bottle for consolation, and the temporary relief of course added to the normal despondency:— 'Though I go into jovial scenes, I feel no pleasure in existence except the mere gratification of the senses. Oh, my friend, this is sad!'

An unpublished letter from Temple to Mrs. Temple contains a proof that the reverend friend was by no means a vigilant guardian or a severe monitor: 'On Sunday, Boswell and I communicated. You know we dined at Forster's: he drank too much Madeira, and got intoxicated, and was seen staggering on the ramparts. This was both wrong and indiscreet.' On another occasion, he was robbed and ill-treated when insensible or defenceless from drunkenness. A second marriage was suggested, and Sir W. Scott (Lord Stowell) promoted a scheme for marrying him to Lady Scott's sister. It does not appear why this failed; but later in the same year (1791) he speaks of having had 'several

‘matrimonial schemes of late,’ with which he promises to amuse Temple at Auchinleck. None of them came to maturity. His circumstances annually became more and more straitened; his melancholy increased: his master-vice grew upon him; and on May 19. 1745, he died,—a memorable example of talent impaired by vacillation of purpose, health and happiness sacrificed to self-indulgence, worldly prospects blighted by misplaced ambition, and solid reputation frittered away by vanity.

Before examining how far these recent revelations are likely to vary the popular or critical estimate of Boswell’s character, to weaken or strengthen his authority, we wish to call attention to the value of the ‘Letters’ as aids to literary history. Thus the letter (p. 201.) contains several specimens of the table-talk of Hume, and gives us a glimpse of the feasts of reason at Edinburgh in its Augustan age.

‘On Thursday I supped at Mr. Hume’s, where we had the young Parisian, Lord Kames, and Dr. Robertson, — an elegant supper, three sorts of ice-creams. What think you of the northern Epicurus style? I can recollect no conversation. Our writers here are really not prompt on all occasions, as those of London.

‘On Saturday, the Parisian and Mr. Hume and some gentlemen supped with me, — no fruit that night either. But the word fruit makes me recollect that Hume said Burke’s speech on Reconciliation with the Colonies, which I lent to him, had a great deal of flower, a great deal of leaf, and a little fruit.’

Who but Boswell would have recorded the three ice-creams! Hume’s remark was obviously a paraphrase of Pope’s couplet—

‘Words are like leaves, and where they most abound,
Much fruit of sense beneath is seldom found.’

Readers of the ‘Life,’ in which Gibbon and Adam Smith are frequently mentioned, should bear in mind that neither of these eminent men had been fortunate enough to conciliate the favour of the biographer.

‘I don’t know but you have spoken too highly of Gibbon’s book; ~~the~~ Dean of Derry, who is of our Club as well as Gibbon, talks of answering it. I think it is right that as fast as infidel wasps or venomous insects, whether creeping or flying, are hatched, they should be crushed. Murphy says he has read thirty pages of Smith’s “Wealth,” but says he shall read no more: Smith too is now of our Club. *It has lost its select merit.* He is gone to Scotland at the request of David Hume, who is said to be dying. General Paoli had a pretty remark when I told him of this: “Ah! je suis fâché qu’il soit détrompé si tôt.”’

The Club losing its select merit by the introduction of Adam Smith! Gibbon a wasp or insect! This is quite enough

to establish Boswell's claim to rank as what the great moralist professed to like so much, a good hater. But he does not rest satisfied with metaphorical abuse of the historian of the 'Decline and Fall.' On May 8. 1779, he writes: 'He (Gibbon) is an ugly, affected, disgusting fellow, and poisons our literary club to me.'

The printed '*Boswelliana*' is mostly a collection of family sayings compiled by Boswell, with the view of embalming the wisdom and wit of his father, wife, and son, besides his own. Although they have hitherto been confined to a small and extremely select circle of readers, several are worthy of a larger public. Those of the old judge come first:—

'Lord Auchinleck and his son were very different men. My lord was solid and composed. Boswell was light and restless. My lord rode very slow. Boswell was one day impatient to get on, and begged my lord to ride a little faster; "for," said he, "it is not the exercise that fatigues me, but the hinging upon a beast." His father replied, "What's the matter, man, how a chield hings, if he dinna hing upon a gallows?"'

The pointed language in which the stout old Whig and Presbyterian condemned 'Jamie's' style of hero-worship is well known. Jamie, on his side, was not sparing in his sneers at the paternal mode of thinking. After describing Johnson's visit to Auchinleck, and hoping that they had met in another and higher state of existence; he adds: 'But I must observe, in justice to my friend's political principles, and my own, that they have met in a place where there is no room for Whiggism.'

According to a bar anecdote, inaccurately told in one of Lord Campbell's amusing and instructive volumes, a distinguished barrister, lately on the Bench, being asked by a chief baron his reason for drinking porter in the morning, replied that, having to argue a case before his lordship, he was bringing down his faculties to the regular Exchequer pitch. Boswell had hit upon the same expedient. In June 1775, he announced an intention to 'try what living (with his father) in a mixed stupidity of attention to common objects, and restraint from expressing any of my own feelings, can do with me.' In the following August, he writes: 'I have done so all this week to admiration; nay I have appeared good humoured; but it has cost me drinking a considerable quantity of strong beer to dull my faculties.' At the same time he had an unfeigned esteem for the judge, and records of him in the '*Boswelliana*':—

'Lord Auchinleck was one of the most firm and indefatigable judges that ever lived. Brown at Utrecht said, "He was one of those great beams that were placed here and there to support the edifice of society."'

There is a story, mentioned by the Editor of the Letters, that Boswell headed the mob who broke his father's windows for giving judgment against the popular side in the Douglas cause. There is no startling improbability in the accusation. It has been told on good authority of a late right. hon. gentleman who had filled the office of First Lord of the Admiralty, that the first time he entered his official residence was at the head of a body of rioters in his youth. When Lord Irnham challenged his son, Colonel Luttrell, of Middlesex election memory, the challenge was declined on the ground that his Lordship was not a gentleman. Here is a precedent for joining a mob, and one for flinging off filial respect in an emergency. When Boswell's enthusiasm was fairly kindled, he was not the man to be staggered by what he might have deemed idle prejudices or conventional observances. But he must be absolved on this occasion; for we have ascertained that the father gave judgment in favour of the claimant (the direct heir) patronised by the son.

The best or most characteristic of the sayings uttered or provoked by Boswell, and duly recorded in his note-book, are the following:—

‘A stupid fellow was declaiming against that kind of raillery called *roasting*, and was saying, “I am sure I have a great deal of good nature, I never roast any.” “Why, Sir,” said Boswell, “you are an exceedingly good-natured man, to be sure; but I can give you a better reason for your never roasting any. Sir, you never roast any, because you have got no fire.”’

‘Mons. d’Ankerville paid me the compliment that I was the man of genius who had the best heart he had ever known; instancing Montesquieu, Rousseau, Voltaire, Monsieur said, “*A l’ordinaire l’esprit brule le cœur.*”’

If the stupid fellow mentioned in the first of these anecdotes had been at M. d’Ankerville’s elbow, he might have retorted that the reason why Boswell’s *esprit* did not burn up his heart, might be that there was not fire enough.

‘Boswell and John Hume met with a man, in their walk one morning, who said he was aged 103. “What a stupid fellow,” said Boswell, “must that be, who has lived so long.”’

This may be traced to Swift, who, when some one was speaking of a ‘fine old man,’ cried out impatiently, ‘There is no such thing; if either his head or his heart had been worth anything, they would have worn him out long ago;’ an aphorism which has received the most overwhelming refutation. To say nothing of many illustrious octogenarian contemporaries,

it will be admitted that Voltaire's and Goethe's heads were worth something, whatever may be objected to their hearts.

'Boswell was one day complaining that he was sometimes dull. "Yes, yes," cried Lord Kames, "Homer sometimes ~~note~~." Boswell being too much elated with this, my lord added, "Indeed, Sir, it is the only chance you have of resembling Homer."

'At the Court of Saxe Gotha there were two ladies of honour, Mesdemoiselles de Rickslepen (?), very pretty, but very little. Boswell said to a Baron of the court; "Monsieur, il faut les prendre comme des alouettes, par la demie douzaine."

'Boswell said, that "Berkeley reasoned himself out of house and home."

'When Boswell came first into Italy, and saw the extreme profligacy of the ladies, he said, "Italy has been called the Garden of Europe, I think it is the Covent Garden."

'In talking of Dr. Armstrong's excessive indolence, to Andrew Erskine, I used this strong figure: "He is sometimes so idle, that his soul cannot turn itself in its bed."

'There are a variety of little circumstances in life which, like pins in a lady's dress, are necessary for keeping it together, and giving it neatness and elegance.'

'I said that a drunken fellow was not honest. "A stick," said I, "kept always moist, becomes rotten."

'Boswell said, "A man is reckoned a wise man, rather for what ~~he~~ does not say, than for what he says: perhaps upon the whole, Limbertongue speaks a greater quantity of good sense than Manly does, but Limbertongue gives you such floods of frivolous nonsense that his sense is quite drowned. Manly gives you unmixed good sense only. Manly will always be thought the wisest man of the two."

The last of these sayings may help to account for the low estimate that has been formed of Boswell himself. He is a striking proof that the nonsense men talk, as well as the ill they do, lives after them, whilst 'the sense is oft interred with their bones;' and as ill-luck would have it, he has crossed the luminous track of a brilliant historian and critic, whose portraits resemble some of Rembrandt's masterpieces, in which the effect of the light is artistically enhanced by the surrounding intensity of shade. We allude of course to Mr. Macaulay's 'Essay on Croker's Edition of Boswell's Life of Johnson,' recently reprinted in the 'Traveller's Library;' which, considering the time (twenty-five years) since it appeared in this Review, and its frequent republication, may now fairly be regarded as standing on the writer's individual responsibility. Nor does it anywhere appear that he is disposed to soften the severe sentence passed in that celebrated criticism.

'The Life of Johnson is assuredly a great, a very great work. Homer is not more decidedly the first of heroic poets, Shakspeare is

not more decidedly the first of dramatists, Demosthenes is not more decidedly the first of orators, than Boswell is the first of biographers. He has no second. He has distanced all his competitors so decidedly that it is not worth while to place them. Eclipse is first, and the rest nowhere.

'We are not sure that there is in the whole history of the human intellect so strange a phenomenon as this book. Many of the greatest men that ever lived have written biography. Boswell was one of the smallest men that ever lived, and he has beaten them all. He was, if we are to give any credit to his own account, or to the united testimony of all who knew him, a man of the meanest and feeblest intellect. Johnson described him as a fellow who had missed his only chance of immortality by not having been alive when the Dunciad was written. Beauclerk used his name as a proverbial expression for a bore. He was the laughing-stock of the whole of that brilliant society which has owed to him the greater part of its fame.'

'That such a man should have written one of the best books in the world is strange enough.' (*Macaulay's Essays*, pp. 28-31.)

That such a man should have written one of the best books in the world is not merely strange, it is impossible. Will Mr. Macaulay, from whom we always differ (when we differ) with hesitation and regret, pardon us for suggesting that he has here been hurried into the mistake which, to the best of our recollection, he has pointed out, in one of his admirable critical essays, as common amongst writers of fiction? A hero like Eugene Aram, or Paul Ferroll, commits a coldblooded crime from the most commonplace of bad motives—the wish to get possession of money or to get rid of a wife—yet in everything else we see or hear of him he is represented as the mildest, noblest, most humane and amiable of men. The same plan is followed in reference to physical qualities. Thus, in Mr. Disraeli's 'Wondrous Tale of Alroy,' a slender stripling, whose feminine delicacy of form has been especially noted, tears up a young palm tree by the roots and lays about him like another Samson. Yet this is not a more startling improbability than that 'one of the smallest men that ever lived' should be 'the first of biographers,' or (as Mr. Macaulay goes on to say) should, 'in an important department of literature, have immeasurably surpassed such writers as Tacitus, Clarendon, Alfieri, and his own idol, Johnson.' Could such a book have been written without judgment and discrimination, or without some knowledge and appreciation of each of the infinite variety of curious and important topics discussed in it? 'The more I read of the "Journal" the higher I think of you,' was Johnson's remark on the 'Tour to the Hebrides,' which contains its full proportion of indiscretion and egotism. The authorship of

a book giving decided proof of intellectual power, discrimination or capacity, is a positive fact which cannot be neutralised or set aside by any number of weak actions or silly speeches. It is just as logical for a man's admirers or apologists to infer from his writings that he possesses knowledge and judgment, as for his assailants to conclude from his conduct or conversation that he is a fool. Are not the contradictions and inconsistencies of human nature a byeword? Need we look round for a more memorable example than 'the wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind'? Could not Mr. Macaulay, from his own rich and varied stores alone, fill chapters, or occupy hours, with 'fears of the brave and follies of the wise'?

Thus he justly says of Johnson, that 'the characteristic peculiarity of his intellect was the union of great powers with low prejudices. If we judged of him by the best parts of his mind, we should place him almost as high as he was placed by the idolatry of Boswell; if by the worst parts of his mind, we should place him even below Boswell himself.' Nor is it denied that literary men of the highest eminence have been equally remarkable for absurdity in speech and action, but an attempt is made to distinguish their cases from that of Boswell:

'Goldsmith was very justly described by one of his contemporaries as an inspired idiot, and by another, as a being

"Who wrote like an angel, and talked like poor Poll."

La Fontaine was in society a mere simpleton; his blunders would not come in amiss amongst the stories of Hierocles. But these men attained literary eminence in spite of their weaknesses. Boswell attained it by reason of his weaknesses. If he had not been a great fool he would never have been a great writer. Without all the qualities that made him the jest and torment of those among whom he lived, without the officiousness, the inquisitiveness, the effrontery, the toad-eating, the insensibility to all reproof, he never could have produced so excellent a book.

Probably not; but could he have produced so excellent a book wholly and exclusively by dint of his bad qualities? Suppose we admit that his mode of collecting his materials; by forcing himself into the company of eminent men and taking notes of their conversation, was degrading and ungentlemanlike, still he must have had judgment to select them and language to preserve them. 'He had indeed'—continues his censor, and the admission is important—'a quick observation and retentive memory. These qualities, if he had been a man of sense and virtue, would scarcely of themselves have sufficed to make him conspicuous; but because he was a

‘dunce, a parasite, and a coxcomb, they have made him immortal.’ Let parasite and coxcomb pass, although these are hard names; but Boswell was not a dunce, any more than Goldsmith was an idiot; and a great fool, in the broad general sense, can never be a great writer. On this point Mr. Carlyle remarks, in his quaint manner: —

‘*Bad* is by its nature negative, and can do *nothing*; whatsoever enables us to *do* anything, is by its very nature *good*. Alas! that there should be teachers in Israel, or even learners, to whom this world-ancient fact is still problematical, or even deniable, Boswell wrote a good book because he had a heart and an eye to discern wisdom, and an utterance to render it forth; because of his free insight, his lively talent, above all, of his love and childlike open-mindedness. His sneaking sycophancies, his greediness and forwardness, whatever was bestial and earthly in him, are so many blemishes in his book, which still disturb us in its clearness, wholly hindrances, not helps. Towards Johnson, however, his feeling was not sycophancy, which is the lowest; but reverence, which is the highest, of human feelings. None but a reverent man (which so unspeakably few are) could have found his way from Boswell’s environment to Johnson’s.’

Mr. Carlyle’s ‘world-ancient fact’ would appear less deniable to both teachers and learners if he had said that *bad* can do nothing *good*; which is just as good for the argument in hand. In our opinion, Mr. Macaulay has ranked Boswell too high as an author and too low as a man. We think him neither a great writer nor a great fool; and his moral qualities were of the same mixed composition as his mental. He was a weak, vain, and erring mortal; no words are too strong to stigmatise his indelicacy, his sensuality, or his want of self-respect; but if he had not also been frank, cordial, affectionate, good-humoured, generous and confiding to a fault, he would have escaped the larger part of the withering contempt lavished on him. He was always ready to make every imaginable allowance for others; and because he foolishly fancied that they would be equally just or charitable towards him, he displayed, with cool self-complacency, ‘every thing which another man would have hidden.’ The inevitable result was that all his ‘caprices, illusions, and whimsies’ have been judged precisely as if, instead of revealing them, he had been detected in them. He has had no credit for his candour, nor for the utter unconsciousness of confirmed selfishness, malignity, or bad feeling of any kind, which could alone induce the vainest creature that ever lived (at least, in his sane intervals), to lay bare the inmost recesses of his own heart and mind for the edification of his contemporaries.

It was Boswell's fate to furnish the strongest practical confirmation of the worldly prudence of his illustrious friend's advice, never to tell disparaging stories of himself, because they were sure to be repeated to his disadvantage, when the mitigating circumstance of his own narrative would be forgotten or suppressed. When the whole of his most ludicrous or degrading indiscretions are brought together in one glowing and scorching paragraph, they certainly look formidable; and for that very reason, the most scrupulous care should be taken to give due weight to the evidence on the other side. If Johnson told Boswell in the sixth year of their intimacy, that he had missed a chance of immortality by not being alive when the 'Dunciad' was written, it might have been remembered that he wrote in sober seriousness in the seventeenth (Oct. 17. 1780): 'I love you so well, that I would be glad to love all that love you, and that you love.' . . . Perhaps it may please God to give us some time together before we are parted.' If Beauclerc comically threatens a correspondent to send Boswell to talk to him if he does not speedily return to his friends, Beauclerc was fond of Boswell's company, and was zealous for his admission to the Club. If he was a laughing-stock of that brilliant society, so most assuredly was Goldsmith; and, bearing this in mind, we venture to hint, that to be a laughing-stock is not incompatible with genius or with worth. When Lord Stowell was asked whether Boswell was respected in Edinburgh, the answer was, 'Well, I think he had about the proportion of respect that you would guess would be shown to a jolly fellow.' His Lordship, adds Mr. Croker, evidently thought that there was more *regard* than respect. Yet his Lordship was anxious to have this jolly fellow for his brother-in-law.

The testimony of Sir William Forbes, in his 'Life of Beattie,' to Boswell's merits, is too striking to be omitted. 'I have known few men who possessed a stronger sense of piety or more fervent devotion (tinctured, no doubt, with some little share of superstition, which had probably been, in some measure, fostered by his intimacy with Dr. Johnson), perhaps not always sufficient to regulate his imagination or direct his conduct; yet still genuine and founded both in his understanding and his heart.' His social offences almost all resolve themselves into a certain bluntness of perception or absence of sensibility, which rendered him unconscious of the finer shades of conduct or feeling. He justified unauthorised intrusions into the society of celebrated men, on the ground that, if his advances were ill received, he remained where he was before,

making no account of the humiliation or the slight. He invites himself to breakfast with a clergyman at Grantham, and when he is asked to dinner with a polite intimation that the proposed breakfast would be inconvenient, he exclaims: 'What can be the meaning of this? How can breakfasting be inconvenient to a family that dines?' He starts the question whether, when a man knows that some of his intimate friends are invited to the house of another friend with whom they are all equally intimate, he may join them without an invitation. Johnson: 'No, Sir, he is not to go when he is not invited. 'They may be invited on purpose to abuse him' (smiling). Boswell was just the man to increase the hilarity of a convivial meeting, or to promote conversation in an intellectual one. He had inexhaustible good humour and vivacity. He sang a good song, was a capital mimic, and was always prepared to obviate 'the painful effect of the dreary void, when there is a 'total silence in a company for any length of time,' by leaping, with the self-devotion of another Curtius, into the gulf. He had a large stock of miscellaneous topics producible at the shortest notice, and (to borrow Dr. Johnson's phrase) fecundity of images for their illustration.

Several apt metaphors have been already quoted from the 'Boswelliana,' and many more might easily be selected from his letters or journals; as when he compares himself, on the occasion of his bringing Johnson acquainted with Paoli, to an isthmus connecting two great continents; or his remark in allusion to the Duchess of Hamilton's rebuke that, when he recollected that his punishment was inflicted by so dignified a beauty, he had that kind of consolation which a man would feel who is strangled by a silken cord; or his argument that, a man who is not easily made drunk, is most injured by drinking: 'A fortress which soon surrenders, has its walls less shattered than when a long and obstinate resistance is made.' This kind of fancy animates and diversifies conversation, and goes far towards making an agreeable member of society. Boswell's *bons mots* may not suffice to found the reputation of a wit, but we may surely be allowed to say of him in this capacity, what Johnson said of Churchill as a poet: 'To be sure, he is a tree that cannot produce good fruit; he only bears crabs. 'But, Sir, a tree that produces a great many crabs, is better than a tree which produces only a few.'

Contemporaneously with these Letters has appeared, by an opportune coincidence, a very remarkable addition to what may be termed our Johnsonian literature; namely, the biographical and critical article on Johnson in the new edition of

the 'Encyclopædia Britannica.' It is authenticated by the initials T. B. M., and is the avowed composition of the eminent writer whose sweeping condemnation of Boswell we have ventured to contest. When Sheridan, after producing his finest comedy, suspended his labours for the stage, it was whispered that he was afraid of the author of the 'School for Scandal.' Mr. Macaulay might have been excused if he had been reluctant to enter into competition with the author of the account of Johnson comprised in the essay on Mr. Croker's 'Boswell.' So far as it went, this sketch hardly admitted of improvement, but it was susceptible of enlargement and expansion; for the Doctor's personal peculiarities had been dashed off by a few rapid and broad, although firm and masterly, strokes of the brush; and the analytical examination of his writings was postponed. The article in the *Encyclopædia* (which would fill about forty of our pages), comprises a clear, concise, and complete appreciation of him in each phase or aspect of his literary character, — as a poet, a moral essayist, a critic, and a lexicographer. This is entirely new matter, and as there is no immediate prospect of its being republished in a separate or more accessible form, we propose to extract a few paragraphs. Let us first, however, indulge ourselves and our readers by copying one in which Mr. Macaulay has modified, — at all events has expressed in milder and admirably chosen terms, — his opinion of Johnson's religion.

'A deep melancholy took possession of him, and gave a dark tinge to all his views of human nature and of human destiny. Such wretchedness as he endured has driven many men to shoot themselves or drown themselves. But he was under no temptation to commit suicide. He was sick of life; but he was afraid of death; and he shuddered at every sight or sound which reminded him of the inevitable hour. In religion he found but little comfort during his long and frequent fits of dejection; for his religion partook of his own character. The light from heaven shone on him indeed, but not in a direct line, or with its own pure splendour. The rays had to struggle through a disturbing medium: they reached him refracted, dulled and discoloured by the thick gloom which had settled on his soul; and, though they might be sufficiently clear to guide him, were too dim to cheer him.'

The sketch of 'Titty' (Boswell prints 'Tetty') borders on the caricature; and the inmates of Bolt Court are also grouped and drawn in a fashion which partakes somewhat of the license of a fancy piece: —

'At the head of the establishment Johnson had placed an old lady named Williams, whose chief recommendations were her blindness and her poverty. But, in spite of her murmurs and reproaches, he

gave an asylum to another lady who was as poor as herself, Mrs. Desmoulins, whose family he had known many years before in Staffordshire. Room was found for the daughter of Mrs. Desmoulins, and for another destitute damsel, who was generally addressed as Miss Carmichael, but whom her generous host called Polly. An old quack doctor named Levett, who bled and dosed coal-heavers and hackney-coachmen, and received for fees crusts of bread, bits of bacon, glasses of gin, and sometimes a little copper, completed this strange menagerie.

Can this be the Levett of Johnson's celebrated verses? —

'In misery's darkest caverns known,
His ready help was ever nigh,
Where hopeless anguish pour'd his groan,
And lonely want retired to die.

'No summons mock'd by chill delay,
No petty gains disdained by pride,
The modest wants of every day
The toil of every day supplied.'

Were coalheavers and hackney-coachmen the sole or principal occupants of misery's darkest caverns, or were glasses of gin amongst the modest daily wants of their benefactor?

We pass on to those portions of the article which command assent by their justness and comprehensiveness of view, as well as admiration for the point and vigour of the style. After touching lightly on Johnson's contributions to the 'Gentleman's Magazine,' and showing how the debates which he composed, rather than reported, for that miscellany, were warped and discoloured by his prejudices, Mr. Macaulay proceeds to describe the circumstances which preceded and accompanied the embryo moralist's first appearance as a poet, by the publication of 'London' in 1738. What may be called the companion poem, the 'Vanity of Human Wishes,' was not published till eleven years afterwards, when the author's reputation was fully established, and he had been two years at work on his Dictionary. The critical biographer has evidently not made up his mind whether the palm of superiority belongs to Juvenal or his imitator; but, taking it as a whole, we are inclined to think that, in most of the essential qualities of poetry, Johnson has, in the 'Vanity of Human Wishes,' surpassed his prototype. Sir Walter Scott told Ballantyne that he had more pleasure in reading 'London' and the 'Vanity of Human Wishes' than any other poetical composition he could mention; and 'I think,' adds Ballantyne, 'I never saw his countenance more indicative of high admiration than while

‘reciting aloud from these productions.’* Byron, in his diary (1821) sets down: ‘Read Johnson’s “Vanity of Human Wishes:” all the examples and the mode of giving them sublime, as well as the latter part, with the exception of an occasional couplet. ’Tis a grand poem; and so true! true as the 10th of Juvenal himself.’ Johnson received fifteen guineas for the copyright, only five guineas more than was paid for ‘London,’ which was published without his name, and before he had a name of sufficient eminence to excite interest or attract readers.

A few days after the publication of the ‘Vanity of Human Wishes,’ his tragedy, ‘Irene’ was brought on the stage. It must have been considerably advanced before he left Lichfield, for Boswell relates that when Gilbert Walmesley (registrar of the Ecclesiastical Court), to whom he read what he had done, objected that he had brought his heroine into great distress too soon, and asked, ‘How can you possibly contrive to plunge her into deeper calamity,’ Johnson replied, ‘Sir, I can put her into the Spiritual Court.’ At Garrick’s suggestion, he resolved to deepen the catastrophe by having her strangled upon the stage. She was to speak two lines with the bowstring round her neck. The audience cried out *murder*, and she was obliged to go off the stage alive. In all the subsequent representations, she was carried off to be strangled behind the scenes. Some other alterations proposed by Garrick were sturdily resisted by the author, who told Dr. Taylor when he attempted to mediate, ‘Sir, the fellow wants me to make Mahomet run mad, that he may have an opportunity of tossing his hands and kicking his heels.’

The ‘Rambler’ came out every Tuesday and Saturday, from March, 1750, to March, 1752. Mr. Macaulay describes it as enthusiastically received by a few eminent men, although little relished by the public, and he states fairly enough the decision of posterity:—

— ‘On the question of precedence between Addison and Johnson, a question which, seventy years ago, was much disputed, posterity has pronounced a decision from which there is no appeal. Sir Roger, his chaplain and his butler, Will Wimble and Will Honeycomb, the “Vision of Mirza,” the “Journal of the Retired Citizen,” the “Everlasting Club,” the “Dunmow Flitch,” the “Loves of Hilpah and Shalum,” the “Visit to the Exchange,” and the “Visit to the Abbey,” are known to everybody. But many men and women, even of highly cultivated minds, are unacquainted with Squire

Bluster and Mrs. Busy, Quisquilius and Venustulus, the "Allegory of Wit and Learning," the "Chronicle of the Revolutions of a Garret," and the sad fate of "Aningait and Ajut."

If Mr. Macaulay's personal observation and experience have led him to the conclusion that the 'Loves of Hilpah and Shalum,' the 'Visit to the Exchange,' the 'Visit to the Abbey,' or any other of the best papers in the 'Spectator,' (not excepting the admirable critical essays), are 'known to everybody,' he has been extremely fortunate in his society. To the shame of the rising generation and their instructors, be it spoken, the British essayists no longer form an indispensable part of the education of the most cultivated class of either sex; and the late Mr. Rogers once complained in our hearing: 'I was not understood yesterday, when I talked to a budding legislator about Sir Andrew Freepport; and here is a young lady who supposes Seged, Emperor of Ethiopia, to be one of the tawdry potentates discovered by Bruce.'

The 'Idler' is passed over as 'a second part of the "Rambler," somewhat livelier, and somewhat weaker than the first part;' and Mr. Macaulay hastens on to censure the tame plot and palpable anachronisms of 'Rasselas,' without paying due tribute to its elevated morality, its chastening and improving (if depressing) views of life, its sound maxims of conduct, and the melancholy grandeur of the style. Of the Dictionary, he says:—

'It was indeed the first dictionary which could be read with pleasure. The definitions show so much acuteness of thought and command of language, and the passages quoted from poets, divines, and philosophers are so skilfully selected, that a leisure hour may always be very agreeably spent in turning over the pages. The faults of the book resolve themselves, for the most part, into one great fault. Johnson was a wretched etymologist. He knew little or nothing of any Teutonic language except English; which indeed, as he wrote it, was scarcely a Teutonic language; and thus he was absolutely at the mercy of Junius and Skinner.'

He is equally summary in his judgment of Johnson's edition of Shakspeare:—

'The preface, though it contains some good passages, is not in his best manner. The most valuable notes are those in which he had an opportunity of showing how attentively he had during many years observed human life and human nature. The best specimen is the note on the character of Polonius. Nothing so good is to be found even in Wilhelm Meister's admirable examination of Hamlet. But here praise must end. It would be difficult to name a more slovenly, a more worthless edition of any great classic.'

Of the political pamphlets, in one of which Johnson conceived himself to have demolished Junius, we are told: —

‘He had already written two or three tracts in defence of the foreign and domestic policy of the government; and those tracts, though hardly worthy of him, were much superior to the crowd of pamphlets which lay on the counters of Almon and Stockdale. But his “Taxation No Tyranny” was a pitiable failure. The very title was a silly phrase, which can have been recommended to his choice by nothing but a jingling alliteration which he ought to have despised. The arguments were such as boys use in debating societies. The pleasantry was as awkward as the gambols of a hippopotamus.’

This pamphlet was deemed so beneath Johnson, that he was generally supposed to stand in need of some such counsel as *Gil Blas* administered to the Archbishop. This, however, was an error: his faculties remained unimpaired to his dying day, and were never more brilliantly displayed than in his last work of consequence, the ‘*Lives of the Poets.*’ His strength lay in literary history and biography, and from earliest youth he had been unconsciously amassing materials for such an undertaking. ‘The narratives,’ we agree with Mr. Macaulay, ‘are as entertaining as any novel. The remarks on life and on human nature are eminently shrewd and profound. The criticisms are often excellent, and even when grossly and provokingly unjust, well deserve to be studied. For however erroneous they may be, they are never silly.’ After noticing the colloquial ease of the style, as compared with that of the ‘*Life of Savage*’—perhaps the most captivating of all in other respects, — Mr. Macaulay declares that ‘the best are perhaps those of Cowley, Dryden, and Pope. The very worst is beyond all doubt that of Gray.’

Johnson’s dislike to Gray was as strong, and as difficult to trace to its origin, as his prejudice against the Scotch. When Boswell demurred to the epithet of ‘dull,’ as applied to such a poet, Johnson retorted: ‘Sir, he was dull in company, dull in his closet, dull everywhere. He was dull in a new way, and that made many people think him great. He was a mechanical poet.’ On another occasion he called Gray ‘a barren rascal.’ Yet surely the author of the ‘*Elegy*’ and the ‘*Ode on a Distant Prospect of Eton College*’ was at least entitled to the reverse of the praise bestowed on Churchill. It might be said: ‘To be sure he is a tree that cannot produce much fruit; but he bears golden pippins.’

Mr. Macaulay pays an earnest and eloquent tribute to Johnson’s colloquial powers, and speaks of the influence of his conversation as altogether without a parallel. This being so, it is

much to be regretted that he had contracted in youth, and retained to his dying day, the baneful habit of talking for victory. 'Why, No, Sir,' was his ordinary commencement, even when he was about to express his assent, or had no antagonist to encounter. 'He is now,' exclaimed Garrick, as Johnson was swinging backwards and forwards, and tossing a proposition to and fro, 'considering which side he will take.' This practice, besides often disseminating error under the guise of authority, is an affront to those who are forced into the arena as opponents, and fatal to the temper of the pugnacious talker; because, when worsted, he is wounded in his tenderest part, his vanity; he can neither fall back upon the consciousness of truth, nor find pleasure in its discovery. He is in the condition of a chess-player who has contemptuously volunteered to give a knight or bishop, and is beaten. A great deal of Johnson's overbearing manner and rudeness may be traced to this cause. Goldsmith complained that there was no arguing with him, because, when his pistol missed fire, he knocked you down with the butt; and self-respect induced many of the most accomplished of his contemporaries to keep aloof from his society, or (like Fox and Gibbon) to remain silent in it.

He himself one day told Boswell, 'That is the happiest conversation where there is no competition, no vanity, but a calm quiet interchange of sentiments.' Here, however, he is speaking of conversation between two friends; and a little discussion, in which honest convictions are firmly and quietly maintained, is elsewhere mentioned as a desirable element. The fault of the best modern society is its too great affectation of lightness and point. We use up too many subjects without sounding, much less exhausting, them. We saunter through a range of topics, like the author of the 'Castle of Indolence' in Lord Burlington's garden, with his hands in his waistcoat pockets, biting off the sunny sides of the peaches. We put too much pepper in our cream tarts, and try to live upon nothing else. If the colloquial powers of the generation that is just dying out, are to be estimated by what has been preserved in receptacles like Moore's Diary—a valuable and amusing addition to literary and social history, in its way—what will be thought of these in comparison with the generation that preceded them? A great deal undoubtedly depends on the diarist; and if Boswell had been an inmate of Holland House and Bowood, in the days of Sydney and Bobus Smith, Mackintosh, Brougham, Luttrell, Rogers, Hallam, Macaulay, Byron, De Stael, Talleyrand, &c. &c., he would have carried off something more solid and durable than gossip, *bons mots*, and anecdotes. All who coincide with us in

this opinion, must give him credit for discrimination and appreciation enough to expatiate, without losing himself, in a mighty maze of wit, wisdom, argument, learning and knowledge; in other words, for a faculty, or set of faculties, which no admixture of weakness or vanity can render fitting subjects for unmitigated reprobation or contempt.

‘Boswell’s book,’ concludes Mr. Macaulay, ‘has done more for him (Johnson) than the best of his own books could do. The memory of other authors is kept alive by their works; but the memory of Johnson keeps many of his works alive.’ ‘No human being who has been more than seventy years in the grave, is so well known to us.’ That he is so, is good for letters, for morals, for intellectual progress, for sound criticism, for truth. Let us not then be ungrateful to him by whom the ripest fruit of this great teacher’s mind has been preserved. Let us lament his weaknesses, laugh at his absurdities, and condemn his vices; but let us not refuse to balance his merits against his demerits, nor take advantage of his indiscreet candour to rank him below all who, equally powerless to resist temptation, have sought a convenient shelter in hypocrisy.

ART. VIII. — 1. *Historical Notices of the Society of Dilettanti.*

Printed for private circulation only. 4to. London: 1855.

2. *On the Academical Study of Latin.* An Inaugural Lecture delivered in the Theatre Oxford, Dec. 2. 1854, by JOHN CONINGTON, M.A. London: 1855.

NO mere history of Literature can convey an adequate notion of the effects of classical culture on the intelligence of mankind. The Christian Church, retaining and consecrating a language which, however impure, remained Latin in its frame and inflections, led the reviving intellect of the nations of Europe into the old paths of human genius, and transmuted in its traditions many facts and fictions of the ancient world into conditions of modern thought. The spirit of controversial theology has cruelly embittered much interesting investigation into this process of the submission of Greek and Roman Heathenism to revealed religion; and inferences have been drawn, suggested, and refuted, which have rendered historical and philosophical research into the subject difficult, and even dangerous. But the student of the progress of humanity will not willingly abandon these considerations, any more than he will refuse to recognise in the manners and habits of European civilisation many influences of antique and classical life, acting through the

imagination and sympathies of men, in ways of which they were themselves unconscious, and which it requires some care and knowledge to observe.

The most prominent of these associations, no doubt, appertain to the plastic arts, by which the ideas of one age are transmitted to distant generations in repeated or imitative forms; but the same moral energies which produced those arts have been patent and active in later days, and have forced themselves on ungenial climates and unsympathetic Nature. Thus, while the Church spoke the Latin language, and in its ceremonies and traditions represented so much of the Latin life, that Revival of Letters, which has gone on in uninterrupted growth and development up to the present time, appeared not as a fortuitous discovery of unknown treasures, but as a joyful recognition by the human mind of great creations lost in the confusion of material violence, but recovered and appropriated as soon as the social tumult had subsided.

It was also the Roman Law which governed public and private Rights, throughout the greater part of Europe, in the same language with which it had regulated the affairs of the ancient Empire. The Latin tongue was the medium of all education, religious or secular; as soon as it became the business of a Gentleman to read and write at all, it was Latin that he read and wrote. The ecclesiastical ceremonial — the processes of jurisprudence — became intelligible to him only by this means; and by this channel he arrived at all that was then to be known in Philosophy, History, Poetry, and Politics. He studied the classical writers sedulously to become a scholar, and he learnt something of them to become a man of the world. Wide as is the space of thought and time between Charlemagne acquiring his Latin accidence at forty, and the mature scholarship of our royal pedant James I. of England, in both instances the best classical culture of the age adorned the highest social station. And in this the Kings were but a fair example of the Governing Classes.

As civilisation broadens and political powers become more defined, classical literature is seen to be the honourable accomplishment of all aristocracy, and to be treated with regard, and almost with reverence, even by those least susceptible of its enjoyment. The *Paganus* of old was the Man of the Country who remained apart from the new religion that had mastered and converted the Men of the Cities; but the revived Paganism which had arisen in the Church, the Cloister, and the Court, in towns and universities, in all the populous centres of human intelligence, soon left the inhabitants of those rural districts,

that had supplied the old designation, the portion of the community least subject to its influence.

It seemed, indeed, as if this form of human communication had something of a permanent nature about it, so that, by the side of it and in all cases affected by it, the modern languages of Europe grew up and expanded their individual life. Many of these vulgar tongues were themselves but Latin dialects, and others were so intermixed with Latin in the process of their formation, that the conception of the Latin, as the foundation of universal grammar, was by no means unnatural or absurd. The Priest, the Lawyer, the Scholar, and the Statesman could understand one another from Sicily to the Hebrides, while every separate country was split into various provincial peculiarities of speech, making the relation of man to man extremely difficult and the free interchange of ideas impossible. It is incalculable, how much of the moulding of Europe into a certain homogeneity of thought and manner is due to the existence of this common instrument of intellectual intercourse. Just in proportion as a man became educated he ceased to be isolated: just in proportion as his moral and spiritual nature found its expression in language, did that language itself place him in community with distant lands, with men of other habits and other associations. Though the Babel of the material world went on about him, there was one tongue in which there was no confusion, one which, in comparison with the other inchoate and changing forms of speech, almost assumed the character of a primitive language.

We may, in the further course of these remarks, allude to Professor Conington's belief, that this privilege had an injurious effect on the study of Latin philology; but we must say, that for any injury the language suffered in becoming the vernacular of the learned world, there is ample compensation to literature elsewhere. There is no other instance in the history of our race of so great an intellectual convenience. In later times, indeed, France assumed the right of dictating the language of the higher orders of society; and she succeeded, in a great degree, in making French the general medium of diplomacy, and its familiar use a main characteristic of social cultivation on the Continent of Europe. But either from pride or idleness, or both, our nation has sturdily resisted this pretension. Mr. Canning abolished even the partial use of French in the foreign communications of our Government; and at this present moment, when the connexion between the two countries is more close and habitual than it has ever been before, there is nothing so difficult as to bring together

even a small party of British gentlemen who express themselves in the French tongue, we will not say with grace and wit, but even with fluency and precision.

While, then, on the one hand, for centuries the Latin language remained the organ of all serious concerns among civilised men, and, on the other, the young fancy and fresh wit of the educated laity were nurtured with the images and incidents of old classic life, what wonder and what blame that so much of literature has been imitative of those great models of diction and of form? We would not here inquire what check or injury this mimetic process may have caused to the development of the vernacular languages of Europe, but it is certain that this general study produced a conformity of manner in the most careful and ambitious writers, in different countries, to which was fitly applied the Latin word designating the instrument by which the impressions of that language were originally conveyed to the eye: '*Unus sonus est totius orationis et idem Stylus*,'* may be more or less predicated of all European literature. The *first-rate* and independent author, not only in antiquity and philology, but in every branch of learning, was the classic, as '*classicus*' was the designation of the Captain, and not of the seaman, in the fleet. The largest and most solid foundation-stones of those languages which now stand as the open temples of all human thought were hewn out of the classic rocks. It was Virgil, Poet and Magician, who led Dante his wondrous course, and the oddities and subtleties of Rabelais are woven out of the Latinity of the cloister.

Nor could this amount of uniformity in literature be without its effect on taste, art, and manners. The liberal education supposed the liberal mind, and became everywhere the mark and token of the Gentleman. The moral examples of classic history were impressed upon boyhood as lessons of what was noble and just; and the mythology, so much of which is indissolubly connected with the classic life, was permitted to exercise its full influence on the ductile intellect. Some pedantic logician occasionally urged the incompatibility of Catullus and the Catechism, but if he escaped being burnt, like Savonarola, he was hooted down into oblivion. The Inquisition itself never attempted to repress the great Pagan heresy which reigned in every school and had its chair in every university; and the most despotic governments freely permitted the instruction of youth in political ethics, that made Brutus a hero,

* Cic. Brut. 26.

and the Gracchi models of civic virtue. The heathen machinery of poems, such as the *Lusiad*, did not seem to derogate from the Christian character of the work, just as in the adjurations of the Italian people the old Gods still stand side by side with the saint last canonised: *Per Bacco! — Santa Filomena!**

Such an association of words and ideas naturally suggests that these influences must have been strongest in the country which, if not their birthplace, was at least their adopted home. Thus, too, they would probably be the weakest in our distant island, where the Roman colony seems to have always lived apart, alike from the natives they found here, and from the successive immigrations before which they ultimately yielded and fled. It would, indeed, seem something indecorous for a well-bred Italian of any time not to be a good Latin scholar, and the inscriptions, fully worthy of the great lapidary language, which throughout the Italian peninsula still commemorate some graceless restoration or enunciate some totally worthless fact, only excite surprise by their inaptness and misappropriation. The Corinthian capital lies buried in the living leaves of the acanthus, — the mould of centuries has accumulated half up the shafts, — yet we feel that the edifice might have been shattered by an earthquake of yesterday. But how were we, the Britons, 'parted from the world,' to get our classical tastes and classical associations? The Church, indeed, brought us the language and the Law adopted it; but it did not follow that the laity should generally learn Horace or Cicero, or that our grammar-schools and universities should spread classical learning broad-cast through the land. In the domain of Art, our glorious ecclesiastical edifices expressed thoughts and feelings totally distinct from the inspirations of southern architecture; and the manorial halls, scattered over the country, had their own charms of dignity and comfort appropriate to the climate and the locality. How was it then that we so readily accepted the Italian adaptations of classical buildings to modern life, with results both good and evil — good in the multitude of noble mansions from Longleat to Wentworth, which rival the palaces of continental sovereigns, but assuredly evil in that monopoly of the imagination of the upper ranks of society, which caused the commodious and handsome old English house to be regarded as a family misfortune, to be swept away at the first

* The late attempt of the Abbé Gaume had no more success than those that preceded him: it was strongly discountenanced at Rome, and the Bishop of Orleans, Mons. Dupanloup, who took up the other side of the controversy, won a *fauteuil* at the Académie.

opportunity, and in that gradual degradation of classical forms which has ended in Baker Street and St. George's, Bloomsbury? Where were we to learn the true enjoyment of antique sculpture, so distinct from the effigies that repose robed, or armed, upon our tombs, or the tiers of symbolic figures that decorated our cathedrals?

Nothing less, indeed, than the great fraternity of modern society on the basis of classical culture could explain the predominance of these tastes and studies in Great Britain. The study of Greek, indeed, must have gained something from the impetus which the Reformation gave to all literature which was unconnected with Romanism, and from the desire to examine the records of Christianity in their original form. We remember to have met with an old proverbial distich asserting that,

‘Greek, Turkey-cocks, Heresie, and Beere,
Came into England all in one year;’*

where the chronology of the intellectual food is certainly more accurate than that of the material.

In the meantime Italian compositions found early acceptance with our scholars, and filtrated into our popular literature. Our drama looked for its plots to the fecundity of Italian invention; the Italian sonnet became the accredited form in which the independent idea or sentiment could best be clothed; the Italian hand was the perfection of caligraphy; the Italian method was the model of commercial accounts. Few Englishmen went to Italy, but many Italians came to England, and by their conversation, dress, and general habits, familiarised courtly and polite society with Italian manners of life and thought. Among the literary customs of the higher classes in Italy one of the most prevalent was the establishment of Societies of gentlemen that combined agreeable and friendly intercourse with the advancement and study of the Arts. The history of the Academies of Italy would range from the gravest confraternity of scholars entrusted with a task which the wiser and more expansive notions of philology might deem impossible, or, if possible, inexpedient to execute,—viz., that of determining the language of their country, to the gay and comparatively frivolous association of persons who could pretend to no profound knowledge and no peculiar experience, but whose genius and taste led them to appreciate and enjoy what the talents of others could produce.

* In a little book entitled ‘Gleanings.’ Published by authority. London, 1651.

Through the confusions of politics and the changes of time, these Societies have retained much of their vitality; some of them transmitted through generations; some the creatures of place and circumstance; some using ceremonies serious from old and dear associations; others delighting in caricature and burlesque;—each a profit, a pleasure, and a distraction, in these days of darkened social life and cramped or deficient literature.

France, which owes to Italy so much of her science—including her cookery, and so many of her rulers—including the Buonapartes, eagerly adopted the custom, and extended it from the great mother Academy to numberless provincial institutions, of which Voltaire's address to the Academy of Sens, 'Fille admirable, fille sage, qui n'a jamais fait parler d'elle,' is the appropriate model. With us, however, the habit of literary associations has never been common or frequent; the prominence of the character of the individual, and the unwillingness to yield to any authority we have not ourselves constituted, show itself here, as elsewhere, in our national life. Englishmen require to be brought together for any object not connected with profit or business—they do not naturally come. Indeed, Academies have with us come to mean places where children are sent, not associations where grown people meet. We have never submitted our various and pliable language to the governance of any literary hierarchy; whatever unity or consistency it preserves, it owes to the classical tradition alone.

When, therefore, in the year 1734, some noblemen and gentlemen who had travelled in Italy, desirous of encouraging at home a taste for those objects which had contributed so much to their entertainment abroad, formed themselves into a Society under the name of 'the Dilettanti,' it is not surprising that they should avow friendly and social intercourse to be the first great object they had in view, although they soon showed that they would combine with it a serious plan for the promotion of the Arts in this country. For these persons were not scholars, nor even men of letters: they were some of the wealthiest noblemen and most fashionable gentlemen of the day, who would naturally sup with the Regent as they went through Paris, and find themselves quite at home in the Carnival at Venice. These, too, were times of what would now be considered very licentious merriment and very unscrupulous fun—times, when men of independent means and high rank addicted themselves to pleasure and gave vent to their full animal spirits, with a frankness that would now be deemed not only vulgar but indecorous, while they evinced an

earnestness about objects now thought frivolous which it is very easy to represent as absurd. In assuming, however, the name of 'Dilettanti,' they evidently attached to it no light and superficial notion. The use of that word as one of disparagement or ridicule is quite recent. The same may be said of 'Virtù,' and 'Virtuosi,' on which the Dean of Westminster, in his delightful little book on Words has commented with much severity and injustice. The use of 'Virtù' in the artistic sense does not seem to be strictly academical, but that of 'Virtuoso' is so undoubtedly, and it means the 'capable' man — the man who has a right to judge on matters requiring a particular faculty. Benvenuto Cellini talks of the colouring of the Milanese painters as '*virtuosamente fatta*.' 'Virtuoso' the Italians call a man,' says Dryden, 'who loves the noble arts, and is a critic in 'them;,' and our old Glanville speaks of the 'generous Virtuosi, who dwell in a higher region than other mortals.' Thus, when the Dilettanti mention the 'cause of Virtù' as a high object which they will never abandon, they express their belief that the union into which they had entered had a more important purpose than any mere personal satisfaction could give it, and that they did engage themselves thereby in some degree to promote the advantage of their country and of mankind.

Of all the merry-meetings these gay gentlemen had together small records remain. We, looking back out of a graver time, can only judge, from the uninterrupted course of their festive gatherings, from the names of the statesmen, the wits, the scholars, the artists, the amateurs, that fill the Catalogue, — from the strange mixture of dignities and duties and accessions to wealth for which, by the rules of the Society, fines were paid, — and above all, by the pictures that still adorn the walls of the rooms where the Society meets, — how much of pleasantry and hearty enjoyment must have been mixed up with the more solid pursuits of the Members. Cast your eye over the list of those who met together at the table of the Dilettanti any time between 1770 and 1790. Mr. (Sir Joshua) Reynolds, Earl Fitzwilliam, Charles James Fox, Hon. Stephen Fox (Lord Holland), Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick, Charles Howard (Duke of Norfolk), Lord Robert Spencer, George Selwyn, Colonel Fitzgerald (*sus. per. coll.* as his decease is pathetically recorded), Hon. H. Conway, Joseph Banks, Duke of Dorset, Sir William Hamilton, David Garrick, George Colman, Joseph Windham, R. Payne Knight, Sir George Beaumont, Charles Townley, and plenty more of less posthumous notoriety, but probably of not less agreeable companionship. Within another short period come together, as fines

paid 'on increase of income, by inheritance, legacy, marriage or preferment': 5*l.* 5*s.* by Lord Grosvenor on his marriage with Miss Leveson Gower; 11*l.* 11*s.* by the Duke of Bedford on being appointed First Lord of the Admiralty; 10*l.* 10*s.* compounded for by Bubb Doddington as Treasurer of the Navy; 2*l.* 2*s.* by the Duke of Kingston for a Coloneley of Horse (then valued at 400*l.* per ann.); 21*l.* by Lord Sandwich on going out as Ambassador to the Congress at Aix-la-Chapelle, and 2½*d.* by the same nobleman on becoming Recorder of Huntingdon; 13*s.* 4*d.* by the Duke of Bedford on getting the Garter, and 16*s.* 8*d.* (Scotch) by the Duke of Buccleugh on getting the Thistle; 21*l.* by the Earl of Holderness as Secretary of State; and 9*l.* 19*s.* 6*d.* by Charles James Fox as a Lord of the Admiralty.

The Pictures presented by the members to the Society are also characteristic of an enjoyment of mummery and grotesqueness that reminds one of still older times. The earlier ones by Mr. Knapton or Mr. Stuart have little artistic merit, but are sufficiently interesting as records of manners not to be exposed to the chances of accident or decay, and engravings of them, at least in outline, should assuredly be made without delay. There is Lord Sandwich in the character of the great Mahomedan heretic, the Persian Hafiz: there is Lord Holderness as an Italian gardener: there is Lord Galway as a Cardinal, and Lord Le Despencer as a Franciscan monk very ill-behaved: there is Sir James Gray, so long the British Minister at Venice, in the costume of that lively city: there is Lord Blessington as a Spanish Minstrel, and Lord Bessborough as a Turk: there are the Duke of Dorset and Lord Barrington as Roman generals, — and so on through various travesties of unchecked fancy: an exhibition of serious mirth on the whole barely comprehensible in these days when *decus* has become decorum. The two large groups by Reynolds are so well known by their prints that we need only remark that the pictures have well preserved their colour, and remain models of festive scenes. The first, with the Duke of Leeds, Lord Seaforth, and Lord Dundas examining gems, seems to be an illustration of an established toast — 'Viva il Virtù; ' while the latter group, where Sir William Hamilton is comparing the engravings of a vase with the original, represents the canonical sentiment — 'Grecian Taste and Roman Spirit.' The portraits of Reynolds and West, each by his own hand, are on the walls, but we miss the presenece of Sir Thomas Lawrence, Sir Martin Shee, and Sir Charles Eastlake, who have filled the office of

Painters to the Society, and who ought to be there in their personality as well as in their works.

It is surely a remarkable fact that men of the temperament and habits which these pictures exhibit should have been the patrons and friends of anything grave and scholarly. They had all of them, indeed, had the ordinary classical education; and so have thousands on thousands, who, after they left school, have never looked into a classical book, or taken interest in a classical investigation, or cared to remember a detail of classical geography, or retained any pleasure in the little of this knowledge they had been compelled to acquire. The majority, indeed, may have been supposed to retain sentiments analogous to those of Byron towards Horace:—

‘Hated so, —
Not for thy faults, but mine.’

Yet in Professor Kruse’s popular and profound synopsis of the Geography and Antiquities of Greece, entitled ‘Hellas,’ he divides the information which the world has gained upon these subjects into five periods: the first, that in which Greece tells her own story through her poets, historians, and geographers; the second, that of the Roman dominion; the third, that of the Byzantine Empire; the fourth, extending from the fall of Constantinople to the foundation of the Society of Dilettanti; and the fifth from that period to the present time. Nor can this be fairly called the freak or fancy of a German pedant. For besides the general sobriety of the book, and the gravity of its author, he vindicates this division in the following words:— ‘With this association begins a rare period of the Discovery of Greece, in which the greatest geographical accuracy was combined with the most accurate measurements of ancient buildings. All the celebrated Englishmen to whom we are strictly indebted for the more intimate knowledge of Greece were members of this Society, and some of them were completely fitted out for their travels by the Society itself. The names of Payne Knight, Dawkins, Mitford, Stuart, Chandler, Lawrence, B. West, Hawkins, Morritt, Gell, Wilkins, Leake, Horner, adorned this Society of about sixty members, which, from the wealth of many of its associates, was enabled to apply large sums of money to the purposes of discovery in Greece and Asia Minor.’ The only inaccuracy in this statement is the addition of the name of Dr. Chandler to the Society; and we hope it may not be tedious to review shortly what are the chief publications and enterprises which justify so high an estimate of worth from so competent an authority.

In March, 1764, the Society determined to send out a person or persons properly qualified, with sufficient appointments, to some parts of the East, in order to collect information and to note observations relative to the ancient state of these countries and such early monuments of antiquity as are still remaining; which resolution the Committee believed would prove of great utility to the literary world, and redound to the honour of the Society if properly executed. The person selected for the task was Mr. Chandler, of Magdalen College, Oxford, and Mr. Revett and Mr. Pars were appointed to assist him. The sum placed at his disposal was 2000*l.*, and Mr. Wood, the author of the '*Ruins of Palmyra*,' drew up the '*Instructions*,' of which a record remains in Dr. Chandler's '*Travels in Asia Minor*.' The travellers were desired to make Smyrna their headquarters, to exhaust all the subjects of antiquarian interest within eight or ten days' journey of that place, to make accurate measurements, to keep a very minute journal of every day's occurrences and observations, 'representing things exactly in the light they strike you, in the plainest manner, and without regard to style or language, except that of being intelligible;' and to remit this and a general report to the Society, with all the drawings, over which the Society retained a proprietary right. The results of this expedition (which cost the Society about 2500*l.*) were the two popular works of Chandler's '*Travels in Asia Minor*,' published in 1775, and his '*Travels in Greece*' in the following year. The first fruits, indeed, were the volume of Greek Inscriptions, printed at the Clarendon Press in 1774, dedicated '*nobilissimorum atque clarissimorum Virorum Societati dictæ Dilettanti*,' containing the Sigean inscriptions, the marble of which was since brought to England by Lord Elgin, and the celebrated documents detailing the reconstruction of the Temple of Minerva Polias, which Professor Wilkins illustrated in his '*Prolusiones Architectonicæ*.' In 1769 appeared the first volume of that magnificent work, the '*Antiquities of Ionia*,' which for accuracy of observation, beauty of typography, and appropriate grace of design, is unsurpassed by any production of later art and more complete mechanism. It was followed by two others of equal merit, the last of which only appeared in 1840. This book is invaluable to the student of ancient architecture, and has its place in every library of any pretension in the kingdom. The original drawings are deposited in the British Museum, to which was also transferred a part of the frieze of the Parthenon, which Dr. Chandler brought over, and which was a kind of herald of the glorious collection of the Elgin Marbles. A certain mystery hangs over the connexion of Lord Elgin with

this Society. That nobleman would naturally have been one of its most distinguished members, but, although in communication with it, he does not seem to have been elected a member till the year 1831, when he addressed to its Secretary a dignified letter, from which we make an extract.

‘No one knows more intimately than you do, that the impulses which led me to the exertions I made in Greece were wholly for the purpose of securing to Great Britain, and through it to Europe in general, the most effectual possible knowledge and means of improving, by the excellence of Grecian art, in sculpture and architecture. My success to the vast extent it was effected will never cease to be a matter of the utmost gratification to me. If, when it was made known to the public twenty-five years ago, or at any reasonable time afterwards, it had been thought that the same energy would be considered useful to the Dilettanti Society, most happy should I have been to have contributed every aid in my power; but as such expectation has long since past, I really do not apprehend that I shall be thought fastidious if I decline the honour now proposed to me at this my eleventh hour.’

In recurring to these unfortunate circumstances, we but read an additional act of ingratitude on the part of the British public towards this great benefactor. It is historically certain that if these sculptures had remained on the edifices to which they belonged, the greater portion of them would have been destroyed by the artillery of the Turks during the Greek Revolution, and that the antiquarian who saved them deserves the blessing, not the ‘Curse of Minerva.’ We may fully sympathise with the cry of the ‘Antiques’ in Count Platen’s verses: —

‘Here have ye piled us together, and left us in cruel confusion;
Each one pressing his fellow, and each of us shading his brother;
None in a fitting abode, in the life-giving play of the sunshine.
Here in disorder we lie, like desolate bones in a charnel,
Waking, in all that can feel, deep sense of sorrowful yearning
For the magnificent days when as all but alive we were honoured!
Ye, too, have ye no temples, no pleached arcades in your gardens,
Where ye can take us, and plant us all near the unperishing heavens,
After our own sweet wont, to the joy of the pious beholder?’

But there is surely every difference between the respectful transfer of these wonderful relics to such an asylum as the British Museum, and the vulgar pillage which mutilates the monument and disgraces the collector. At any rate the Dilettanti Society would never have joined in the stupid outcry against Lord Elgin on this score, and we are left to the very

vaguest conjecture as to the grounds of his alienation from a body of men with whose objects he so cordially agreed.

Mr. James Stuart and Mr. Nicholas Revett were elected in 1751, and the Society liberally assisted them in their excellent work. Sir James Gray, the British resident at Venice, a member of the Society, had been of much use to them in their travels; and in the Introduction to the second volume of 'Stuart's Athens,' his widow writes, that 'several members had contributed much of their time and knowledge to its publication, and that it is in a great measure owing to them that, after the author's death, the work was not entirely relinquished.' A large number of the plates were engraved from original drawings in their possession.

No other expedition seems to have been undertaken under the auspices of the Society till 1814, when Sir W. Gell, with Messrs. Gandy and Bedford, professional architects, proceeded to the Levant, under instructions drawn up by the present Lord Aberdeen. Smyrna was again appointed to be the headquarters of the mission, and the principal objects of research were fixed to be Samos, Sardes, Aphrodisias, Hierapolis, Tralles, Laodicea, Telmessus, Patara, Cnidus. Fifty pounds per month was assigned to Mr. Gell, and 200*l.* per annum to each of the architects. Notices of this journey, with a full list of the plans and drawings made, were printed by the Society in 1814, but it required an exertion of extraordinary liberality to give to the public the whole results of the enterprise. Although absent only eighteen months, the allowance to Mr. Gell proved quite inadequate (as he at least believed) to the purposes of the expedition, and the additional outlay, combined with the low price of stocks and the disadvantageous exchange with foreign countries, considerably reduced the means of the Society. Each member, therefore, subscribed fifty pounds to the 'Ionian Fund,' and by this means the classical and antique literature of England was enriched with the fullest and most accurate description and representation of important remains of antiquity hitherto given to the world. The benefits of this expedition were extended to the humblest traveller in Greece down to the present time; Gell's road-books were the fathers of all the 'Starkes' and 'Murrays;' their curious and almost comic particularity was a continual source of amusement to the traveller they guided; and no one will ever forget the eagerness with which he looked out for the 'old fig tree on the r^t,' or 'the ancient wall of eleven stones on the l^t,' or the blank he felt when the expected pathway had altogether disappeared. Those few who remember the ever-cheerful host of the 'Villa

'Gellia' at Naples, and have seen him, when utterly crippled with gout, carried about Pompeii, while his bearers staggered beneath their burden with laughter at his humorous talk, will gratefully remember how much the Dilettanti Society contributed to make his talents useful and his life happy.

The contributions of the Society to the æsthetic studies of the time also deserve notice and commendation. Mr. Penrose's '*Investigation into the Principles of Athenian Architecture*' was printed in 1851. Although mainly scientific, and especially devoted to the optical refinements exhibited in the construction of the ancient buildings at Athens, yet the general descriptions of the edifices are most valuable to the general scholar as representing their features and characteristics with the fidelity of a learned observation. We would recommend the chapters on Polychromy to the attention of the student who has been either seduced by the theories of Mr. Owen Jones, or repelled by his audacious practice in the Crystal Palace; for the observed facts of the subject are here carefully stated, and a lithotint, where the parts of the external architecture, on which signs of finished ornaments or colour have been remarked, are given in *chiaroscuro*, is a model which should be imitated in all accurate exhibitions of ancient buildings. We believe Mr. Penrose to have been the first to have suggested that the pure white of the polished masses of the Parthenon was toned down to the appearance of ivory, the yellow tinge still visible on some parts of the columns, not arising (as has been conjectured) from the oxidation of iron contained in the Pentelic marble, but having been applied externally with such delicacy as to reduce the high light of the fresh marble without altogether obscuring its crystalline lustre. The rich examples which are given of the parts of the stringcourse that are comparatively bright, and the various specimens of the ornaments in the centres of the coffers of the ceiling of the Propylæa, show that he does not shrink from the representation of even gaudy colouring when forced upon him by indisputable evidence.

The excellent design to publish select '*Specimens of Ancient Sculpture preserved in the several collections of Great Britain*' was carried into effect soon after the publication of the second volume of '*Ionian Antiquities*.' Mr. Payne Knight and Mr. Townley contributed the larger portion of the objects engraved, and superintended their execution. The artists employed were Henry Howard, Andrea Tendi, William Newton, John Agar, and William Evans, excellent in their day, though the manner now appears somewhat rough, and better suited to the representation of bronze than of marble. The plates for the

second volume were commenced before the first was out; but they exhibit a more delicate handling, and are quite satisfactory. The literary lectures of Mr. Knight commence the first volume and close the second. These dissertations on the history of sculpture and the symbolical language of ancient arts remain unchallenged in their taste and scholarship, after many years of further inquiry into the subject both here and abroad. Knight's Latin style was accused by competent scholars of baldness and affectation, but his English is simple and vigorous. The defects of his mind were those of the scholars of his time; and if the later investigations into mythology have gained by approaching the matter in a more reverential spirit and with a deeper sense of the latent truth in the religions of humanity, if it is now understood that the most accurate philology is in itself inadequate to explain the mysterious workings of the old imaginations of mankind, we must remember that we owe the possibility of such a generalisation to the freedom of thought which the men of the seventeenth century asserted and obtained. The first volume of these Selections is now out of print, and is only to be obtained at occasional book sales. We should be glad to see a new edition of it, and still more should we be gratified, if the Society would continue the work. Not only are the great collections in the mansions of our nobility here imperfectly represented, but a considerable number of sculptures have been brought home of late years by casual travellers, which are dispersed throughout the country, and nearly as much buried as in their Italian mould. These would come to light if the Dilettanti Society were to offer to engrave and publish them; and it might be a question whether the discovery of photography might not be brought to bear advantageously on this project. It is in the reproduction of sculptural, as of architectural forms, that this art has hitherto been most successful. The sun may be a poor amateur in portrait-painting, but he is an admirable copyist of artistic grace; for the living figure is best represented by his aid when it is most a statue. We do not know what enterprise the Society may at present have in hand; but we could not suggest one more useful or likely to be more popular than this, within the proper range of its functions.

About the year 1820, those admirable monuments of the best period of Grecian Art, called the Bronzes of Siris, were discovered on the banks of that river, and on the field of battle in which Pyrrhus king of Epirus defeated the Romans, B.C. 280. They became the property of the Chevalier Brøndsted, who brought them to this country and offered them to the

British Museum in 1833 for 1000*l*. The Trustees could not afford this outlay, and the Dilettanti Society immediately organised a subscription, which produced above 800*l*. The Trustees completed the purchase, and the Society engraved them, adding to the work a complete archaeological essay concerning them by Brøndsted himself,—of whom Mr. W. Hamilton speaks as having done more towards the illustration of the Elgin Marbles than any other labourer in the same field.* This custom of subscriptions for public objects of art and utility seems to have been frequent in the history of the Society: we find them in 1736 contributing to the erection of that Westminster Bridge over which the footsteps of our generation are treading the last; and in 1783, assisting in establishing the Italian Opera as an English amusement,—an object not exactly within their province, but to which the associations of many members naturally inclined them; for to men accustomed to study and enjoy the ancient drama, with its fixed marks and formal symbols, the disguise of the foreign language and the mask of music would rather have the effect of an historical style of art than of a fortuitous and unnatural representation.

The liberality of the 'Dilettanti' to another sister art is connected with an institution which, then humble, though justly aspiring to usefulness and power, has now fully attained the objects proposed—the Royal Academy. The scheme of an Academy for the encouragement of Painting and Sculpture occupied the Society as early as 1748; and in 1755, a letter was written by their Secretary to the members of the Academy of Painting, 'to return their thanks for the particular regard shown in their application to them as a body and to every member respectively; and that as soon as the proposed scheme is brought to any maturity and a charter obtained, the Society will be ready to give them all the assistance that shall be in their power.' And the elegant paper on the influence of the Fine Arts which accompanied this letter is believed to be due to the pen of Burke. In agreement with this Committee of Painters (which included the names of Reynolds and Roubillac) it was resolved at a general meeting, 'that the President of the intended Royal Academy should be always and annually chosen from the Society of Dilettanti, and that all the members of the Society should be members of the

* One at least of these exquisite designs has been transferred to the imperishable surface of Oriental chalcedony by the late Signor Pistrucci, whose gifted daughters still keep alive in this country the elaborate art of cutting gems in the finest classical taste.

Academy, but that only the twelve senior members present at the meeting should have votes.' In a former communication with the Committee it had only been solicited that the first President should be nominated by the Dilettanti. We are unable to state whether either of these arrangements was effected, but it is certain that the Painters obtained their charter mainly through the patronage and influence of the Society; and in 1774 the interest of 4000*l.* Three per Cents. was appropriated by the Society to the use of sending two students recommended by the Royal Academy to study in Italy or Greece for three years,—the Society approving the choice of the students. Mr. Jeffries, painter, and Mr. Banks, sculptor, were the first students nominated by the Royal Academy, but the Society only accepted the former, and substituted that of Mr. Pars for Mr. Banks.

There are some persons to whom it will seem that the Art of this country owes no gratitude to the Society for its assistance in establishing the Royal Academy. The abstract advantage of such an institution is fair matter of discussion; but, considering the susceptibility of the artistic character, especially when combined with our British idiosyncrasy, it is surprising that the Academy has not produced more differences and ill-will. It has, indeed, been strongly accused of discouraging genius and of dispiriting the exertions of original minds. All forms of authority, including the classical, may be obnoxious to this charge, but it does not appear to us that this is the direction in which much danger exists. In the case of Haydon, whose conflicts with the Academy have been revealed to us in such affecting truth, it assuredly was not any originality of the painter which brought him into the antagonism; and the ready recognition of the merits of Mr. Millais at least shows that the present members accept the indications of power and industry even where the majority would find much to disapprove. It is rather in the tolerance of mediocrity, in the reciprocal laudation of poor and imperfect works, in the repression of free and intelligent criticism, that such institutions are prone to exercise an injurious influence, and to permit the amicable relations of a confraternity to override the conscience of the artist and the duty of the judge. But, on the other hand, it is very doubtful whether, without some such bond and school as this, the regular instruction of youth in the principles of Art would have been continuously maintained, and the public interest in these matters permanently secured. There might have been periods of greater effervescence, but there would have been times of greater depression. The regular and systematic study due to

the lessons of the first artists of the period, freely and gratuitously given to the students, cannot have been without its effect; while the munificent charity, distributed among the less fortunate members of the profession, out of the funds of the Institution, has endeared it to many a household of afflicted or unsuccessful talent. The annual symposium, at which the highest political and social personages assist with an evident pleasure very different from the persecuting obligation of public dinners, and the unfailling Exhibition with its many local imitations, must have done much to the advantage of art and artists in a country where genius is hardly reputable unless associated with some formal respectability.

That a Society possessing so much wealth and social importance as the Dilettanti should not have had a settled abode in the metropolis, can hardly be accounted for by those habits of the last century, which made it no derogation for the best company to meet at coffee-houses, and when Almack's and White's were taverns. Liberal as these pages show their contributions to art to have been, yet they themselves were rich enough besides to build an appropriate edifice not only for their own comfort, but for the exhibition of works of art which they possessed and might acquire. In 1747, indeed, we find them obtaining a plot of ground in Cavendish Square for this purpose, purchasing Portland stone, and paying for the foundation; but in 1760 they disposed of the property, making 1000*l.* by their bargain. Between 1761 and 1764 the project of an edifice in Piccadilly, on the model of the Temple of Pola, was agitated by the committee, and the King petitioned to grant the land. Two sites were proposed: one between Devonshire and Bath Houses the other on the west of Cambridge House. Either of them would have been suitable; and such a building would have stood well in our time, when Sir B. Hall's skilful arrangement of the ground has made Piccadilly one of the finest terraces in Europe. We do not know whether the abandonment of this scheme was owing to the refusal of the Crown or some change of opinion in the Society, which seems also to have attempted, without success, to purchase different taverns where their meetings were held, and also to have failed in obtaining a portion of Montagu House, at the time it was appropriated to the British Museum. If any of these plans had been accomplished, the collection of the Dilettanti would have become one of the instructive exhibitions of this metropolis, exclusive, perhaps, in the direction of its taste, and precise in its objects of imitation. It might have left to other institutions the deformities of India and the monsters of Babylon, but archæology

would not have suffered by the separation, and the assertion of the true limits of Art would not have been without its use in the education of the people.

The account of the Transactions of the 'Dilettanti,' to which we owe the facts of this article, is by the patriarch of classical art — Mr. William Hamilton, Secretary to the Society. The body now comprehends the names of distinguished patrons of Art and gentlemen of scholarly attainments, extending from the commencement of the century to the present time. There Lord Northwick, Col. Leake, Lord Lansdowne, Lord Aberdeen, and Lord Broughton may meet men of the present generation, professing the same objects, and apparently stimulated with the same desire to foster the old flame of classical life and pass on the torch to future ages. But as we began with some remarks on the phenomena of the post-humous power of the ancient life over the mind of the latter world, so we would now direct our attention for a few moments to the true relation which that influence bears to the times in which we find ourselves.

It requires no deep philosophy to understand that the moral and intellectual characteristics of any period can hardly be discerned by those who are close upon them: each man reflects them in his own nature, and believes the coloured or distorted object to be the reality. With this reserve, we express our belief that our lot is cast in that moment of this world's life in which the great instrument of civilisation, the Classical Culture, is ceasing to occupy the minds and regulate the intellectual motions of mankind. There are many who would find in this persuasion no cause for regret, and these not among the ignorant nor the vulgar. If the tradition was a guide, it was also a check; if it drew up the ordinary intelligence, by certain fine and analogous processes, to a certain level of noble thoughts and graceful expressions, it cramped within the same framework many luxuriant growths of fancy and many genuine diversions of genius. As long, indeed, as the Latin language was the vernacular of the education of Europe, by that very fact it acquired a certain liberty of development; and while it might lose something in its philological structure, it gained in its adaptation to the various requirements of the advancing world. But when the modern languages gained their perfect stature, and claimed to be written and spoken by all men as the organs of their separate nations, and the classic tongue declined to the use of mere scholars, and soon ceased to be the medium of general communication even there, no variation of its authentic shape was longer possible, and it only retained the powerless

faculty of a dead form of speech. Mr. Conington, in the interesting Lecture to which we have before alluded, regards this circumstance as an advantage for the study of the language; but we so little agree with him, that we look on the fact of the appointment of a Professor of Latin in the University of Oxford as in itself a strong proof of the diminution of the classical spirit. This very eulogy of the Latin language reads like a funeral oration over that condition of study, when the colloquialisms of life, the banter of youth, the academic sports (of which the 'Westminster Play' is allowed to linger as a belated representative), the principles of philosophy, and the verities of religion, spoke the great common diction. It seems to us like establishing an annual lecture upon the principles of Liberty in the place of the working of the British Constitution. Nor practically is it true that the cultivation of the Latin language has improved since its close as a mode of speech. What is now the Latin, and who are the Latinists of Europe? The veteran Landor wields his double-edged sword of British and Roman eloquence, but his very familiarity with the instrument is urged against him, and when he tells you he is not writing a Latin style imitative of the Augustan or any other age, but such a Latin as he would have written had he been a Roman born;—defending the Gracchi or denouncing Sylla,—the pretension is considered extravagant or unmeaning. And when Dr. Donaldson takes this means of announcing that the work he thus writes is conveyed in this form 'ad clerum,' the 'clerus,' instead of answering in the same decorous fashion, lays the whole at once 'coram populo,' unable or unwilling to conceive a controversy which should be preserved from misapprehension and ridicule by the limitations of a learned language. It is matter of notoriety that in our Universities, and in those of the Continent, the quality and the quantity of written Latin is daily declining. The standard works for the study are becoming scarce for want of demand. For example, how many copies of the 'Lexicon Ciceronianum' of Nizolius are sold in Oxford or Cambridge in the course of the year? It will surely soon become a question whether there is any use in forcing every student to write something in a language which he no longer pretends to possess. The faculty of writing Latin decently is now confined to few, and it should only be required from few, as a standard of high scholarship. The bad Latin of these times has nothing to do with the old familiar, handy, and sometimes barbaric dialect; it is the simple result of ignorance; and the little accomplishment it implies is of course thrown aside the moment the object for which it was acquired is obtained or lost.

But it is a still stronger index of the intellectual tendencies of our time that even those who succeed in attaining the highest classical honours at our universities dismiss the subject from their minds when they mix in political and common life. It is not only that the young politician's 'first speech,' with its apposite quotations and its scholarly tone, is a custom of the past; not only that such a publication as established the reputation of Payne Knight, and made him a man of fashion, would now exclude him from respectable houses, and seriously damage his prospects in life; but that in the writings and the speeches of these very men, in their occupations, and in their amusements, you are not conscious of the presence of the old spirit, you do not taste the flavour of the ancient grace, and you think that they might just as well have been devoting their youth to Sanscrit as to Greek, to German as to Latin. The classical feeling of the upper classes of Englishmen in the last century was closely connected with political life and political importance. Sir R. Walpole was an excellent scholar,—so were Pitt and Fox; and the tradition has not failed with Canning or with Palmerston, nor yet with Mr. Gladstone or Sir G. C. Lewis, who are more nearly agreed on the text of Homer than on the conditions of the Budget. Sixty years ago this familiarity with the classics in most cases implied the use of French and Italian; and thus we find that the elder men who had been shut up in England during the whole of the continental war, are, if anything, better instructed in those languages than the younger, who spend winter after winter in Rome, and to whom Paris is as accessible as Edinburgh.

The story of the decline of classical influence on literature is beyond our scope and intention: it is not only written in many languages, but on the face of the languages themselves. In France its main incident is the duel between the Classic and Romantic schools; in England it comprehends all that lies between Addison and Carlyle, and the miniature of the same process in America between Washington Irving and Emerson. With us, indeed, the classical manner had long been the continual distinction of polite literature. In the rotundities of Gibbon, in the tripartite sentences of Johnson, the classical basis of style is as visible as in the simplicity of Addison or the clarity of Hume. To subordinate the Saxon to the Roman element, to keep out new words and forms of expression, or, if they were absolutely necessary, to conform them to classical analogies, was a primary duty with a good English writer. And this practice extended to all cultivated society. The fair knowledge of the classics generated the fair current English, and when

a man aspired to notoriety in public life, whatever else his deserts might be, it was an indispensable requisite that he should clothe his thoughts in some such form. Inaccuracy of phrase and vulgarity of diction were matters of general ridicule among our forefathers, who, fresh from their rough talk and energetic execrations, had somehow or other a pleasure in, and a perception of, the graces of the popular classics which is now wanting in the far more polished and better-informed representatives of the same order of men. The indignation of Fielding's Ensign who had an equally disagreeable remembrance of Homer 'and the 'other rascal Corderius who got him many a flogging,' is excited by the circumstance that 'Thomas of our regiment 'always carries a Homo in his pocket'—a trait of character by no means probable in a marching officer of these 'examining' days. It is quite a characteristic of latter times that ladies should be almost ashamed of a knowledge of the ancient languages; formerly, it was an accomplishment that carried others along with it, and became the foundation of some of the most agreeable English that has been written. Those who had the happiness to be acquainted with that delightful example of the intelligent old age which bridges over generations, the late Miss Berry, will recall the natural and appropriate way in which the verses of Horace or Virgil suggested themselves to her, and enlivened her conversation without a notion of pedantry.

The foundations of this change in the thoughts and expressions not only of this country but of the civilised world must lie deep. Not to go farther back, the great French Revolution ('the Dowager,' the French now call her) accelerated, while it pretended to arrest, the fall of the traditional literary authorities. Our friend Gracchus, with his Titus hair, and the Goddess of Reason draped as Lucretia, were the real romantic iconoclasts of the classic faith, whatever they thought themselves to be. The most abundant periwig at the court of Louis XIV., or the bitterest satire against the 'Précieuses' of Paris, were in nearer relation to the thoughts and manners of the ancients than all the travesties of classic liberty. And now henceforward the actual modern life must stand alone on its own truths, and with its own forms of utterance, and what was before a loyal love of the lessons of the early masters and teachers of the intellectual world, will seem to many a servile and unworthy dependence. The new ideas of the dignity of labour, of the worth of men as men, of the dangers of privilege, of society without subject classes, are wholly alien to the associations of the old history of Southern Europe. The Roman Church, indeed, as we have already hinted, almost reciprocated the

liberality of the Roman Emperor who offered a place in the Pantheon to the Founder of Christianity, by the permission it gave to the moral dominion of the classic writers over the spirits of youth, and by its perpetuation, in its most solemn functions, of the ancient language.

But in proportion as the true historic character of Christianity has come forth in the air of free thought and free discussion, the 'Religion of Sorrow' stands in ever more distinct antagonism to the plenary enjoyment of the senses and the all-sufficiency of Nature, which pervade the mind of classic antiquity, and of which the Mythology is nothing more than the imaginative reflection. Christian and Classic life have got on together somehow or other: it will not be so easy with Christian and Heathen philosophy. Thus, too, the gradual predominance of the family-life over the interests and diversions of separate classes, — the substitution of the calmer pleasures of domestic existence for the excitements of society, — tend to diminish all the traditionary influences, intellectual and moral, of a general culture, — to turn every man towards the action of his own mind, if he has one, and to isolate him in his own originality or in his own dullness. Polite literature implies the friction of society which should give the polish. Elegance is impossible without society to distinguish it, and thus this very word, though unexceptionable in its meaning and derivation, has fallen into disuse. Conversation cannot exist except where men are brought together with a basis of common knowledge and common sympathies; and from an art, which the best and wisest delighted to cultivate, it descends to the rude and necessary interchange of thoughts, without wit, without grace, without colour. Our enlarged politics, our improved morals, our deeper religious convictions, are a weighty compensation for these losses, and yet we linger over the old weak and faulty world with a natural tenderness. It may be quite unimportant to humanity that the *Laocoon* should be pronounced in four syllables; and yet when we first heard a well-educated American pronounce it like 'racoön,' it made us shudder. We shall get used to it.

Even in France, though convulsions and changes, to which the social life of this country has not been exposed, have effaced the classical traditions and mutilated the language of the great masters of French literature, the old quarrel of Perrault and Boileau, of La Motte and Madame Dacier, is neither allayed nor forgotten. It has been revived in the present century by the rival votaries of the classic and romantic schools; and in a very elegant and entertaining volume entitled '*Histoire de la*

'querelle des Anciens et des Modernes,' Professor Rigault, who is now one of the most popular lecturers in the Schools of Paris, has recently passed in review the varied incidents of this protracted controversy. The second part of this book, in which a sketch of the history of classical taste in England is thrown into the form of an imaginary conversation between St. Evremond, Wotton, Dryden, and Sir William Temple at Wills', is so gracefully executed, that we regret we have not space to borrow the passage; but we recommend those of our readers whom we may have had the good fortune to inspire with an interest in this subject, to pursue it under M. Rigault's guidance.

In the meantime, we in England have still the 'Dilettanti Society,' and we shall not, we are sure, be any worse on the whole, if it continues and extends its influence. There is so much to draw us the other way, that some counterbalance may assuredly be permitted. Whether or not the ancient kings of thought be utterly deposed, whether they still hold an uneradicable power over the imagination of mankind, time alone can determine. True it is that no young poet now, as did Milton and Pope, paves his way to fame by his Latin verse; but, on the other hand, there is no more signal instance of the assimilation of classical ideas with human genius, without any external connexion or educational aid, than in the works of Keats, and the rank they have taken in British literature. There is, too, no reason to believe that classical scholarship need perish, even if the indirect influences of which we have here written cease to prevail. The study of Greek, no doubt, will supersede in a great degree that of the inferior language, as it has already done in Germany; and if we are driven to the choice, there is no doubt this is the right one, not only for its own sake, but because, in a certain extent, the purer and more perfect language includes the other.

It is, perhaps, in the direction of Art that the exertions of the Dilettanti ought mainly to tend. We have London to extend and partially reconstruct; we have continually new public buildings to erect both there and throughout the kingdom. On questions of this nature the counsel and influence of the 'Dilettanti Society' ought to be sought, and the extremely confused notions of city scenery and decoration at present prevalent brought to the test of the true principles of art. In the equally important matter of the locality and arrangement of our national treasures of ancient art, the judgment of a permanent body of men who have made the study of these monuments their habit and delight, might fairly be preferred to that of committees and

commissioners, who come fresh to the subject, and in many cases win from the witnesses they examine the knowledge which ought to be the primary qualification of their existence.

At the same time, however apathetic may be the Greek government and the Greek people in the search and preservation of the great past, yet in the many years that have elapsed since any systematic archæological investigation has been made, many works of art must have come to light even by chance, and difficult questions of topography must have gained means of elucidation by the clearance of ground and the opening of pathways. Has Colonel Leake, whose criticism of ancient geography is not blunted by age (as his late analysis of some disputed points in Dr. W. Smith's most erudite Dictionary fully manifests), no vigorous pupil to emulate his activity and zeal? We believe, indeed, that our sagacious Consul at Rhodes, Mr. Newton, is in communication with the Society, and that he has imparted to them the results of the important excavations he is superintending, and which, if reports be true, have brought to light the mysteries of the original 'Mausoleum.'

Other objects, other uses of their undiminished resources, will present themselves to the members of the Dilettanti Society. We have indicated some of the advantages they have conferred upon this country, and we shall rejoice, if after some years, we can resume the subject by showing they have accomplished much more, in the spirit of the motto of the work before us — *Seria ludo*.

ART. IX. — 1. *The Chinese and their Rebellions, viewed in connexion with their National Philosophy, Ethics, Legislation, and Administration.* By M. S. TAYLOR MEADOWS, Chinese Interpreter in Her Majesty's Civil Service. 8vo., with Maps. 1856.

2. *Papers relating to the Proceedings of Her Majesty's Naval Forces at Canton.* Presented to both Houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty: 1857.

3. *Correspondence respecting Insults in China.* Presented to the House of Lords in pursuance of their Address of February 12th, 1857.

RECENT events in China have excited a degree of public interest not frequently extended to countries lying beyond the Ganges. The magnitude of the commerce at stake, and the importance of the issue as regards peace or war, would in

this instance have sufficed, without the further stimulus of a six nights' debate and a Parliamentary dissolution, to fix attention on the leading circumstances of a crisis in Chinese affairs, sufficiently serious to necessitate the immediate despatch of a large force from this country. But it is fortunate for British interests abroad that Home Politics should have lent increased zest to this subject. The Trans-Gangetic countries, though extending over the largest portion of Asia, have hitherto appeared to lie beyond the horizon of our political interest and our national sympathies, and yet they are destined, at no distant period, to claim a large share of both. Even at the present time, it is to these countries we owe no insignificant portion of our commercial activity and wealth; and now for the fourth time within some thirty years, our relations with the remote possessions of these Eastern potentates have involved us in serious wars, for the defence of interests too valuable to be lightly sacrificed, and the maintenance of rights which no independent State can afford to relinquish. This frequently recurring necessity for an appeal to arms in the arbitrament of our differences, suggests an inquiry of deepest interest, as to what are the necessary conditions of European intercourse and European commerce with these Eastern races.

The real questions at issue between the British and the Chinese authorities at Canton were clearly not questions of municipal law, either of England or of China—but of international law and treaty rights. And they were two. 1st. The international and treaty right to confer the characters and privileges of a British vessel, upon such conditions of ownership and domicile as we might see fit. 2ndly. The right of free and ready access to the Chinese local authorities resident within the city of Canton, which had been injuriously and offensively denied us at that port alone of all the five opened by treaty. The first of these was raised by Yeh in forcibly boarding a vessel under our flag, taking her crew out, and refusing, when called upon, reparation and the recognition of his wrong. The second arose out of the first, and was pressed by Sir John Bowring as a right, which it was at our option to insist upon, whenever it should be found necessary or expedient.

But it did not suit the purpose of those who only sought for grounds of attack against the Government, to argue the question on this broad ground of international law and treaty rights. It was accordingly shifted to the more debateable region of legal technicalities arising out of our own municipal law, on the interpretation of which the highest legal authorities in both Houses of Parliament differed. Yeh did not raise the question

of these registers being in accord or otherwise with our own shipping act or colonial ordinances—he raised the question of International law and Treaty right, and this only. He accused the owner of the lorchas of having *bought* the flag, and said we could by such law neither sell nor lend our flag;—to which Sir John Bowring replied, the flag had not been so obtained, but that the ‘Arrow’ lawfully bore the British flag, and by it was entitled to British protection. It was indeed clearly as much beyond Yeh’s knowledge, as it was out of his competence as a Chinese authority, to discuss our municipal law. He did not once raise the question either (which he might have done perhaps with better show of reason,) as to any want of form or irregularity in fulfilling the conditions of the Register in regard to date and renewal. He chose to rest the defence of his act of violence on the incapability of the British Government, under treaty or international law, *to confer the rights of a British vessel on lorchas built and owned by Chinese.*

This was the question, and the only question raised—and that which, by similar high-handed acts, in violation of the respect due to the national flag, he had repeatedly, in the face of serious warning and remonstrance, taken upon himself to decide, without reference to, and in defiance of, the British authorities. If Yeh or any Chinese authority is to be the judge, and the sole judge too, of such a question as this, the flag of every foreign nation only grants rights or security *in so far as a Chinese official sees fit to allow it*; and the first consequence would be to strike a whole class of vessels, forming a part of our navigation, and essential to our trade as recognised by treaty, out of the list of those which we may legitimately employ and protect.

We say this would be the first consequence—and one sufficiently grave, and injurious alike to our material interests and our national dignity, to make us pause, before we admitted such a novel exposition of international law or treaty rights. But who can doubt that the Lord Chancellor was quite right when he stated, ‘no one could foresee the amount of mischief that would result’? The duty of protecting the national flag from insult and of enforcing respect for its immunities, is one to which all civilised States in their intercourse with each other have ever attached the highest importance; and rightly so, for where that is wanting, there can neither be true sovereignty nor national independence. But if it is of gravest importance between civilised States, how much more must it be so in the relations between a civilised and an oriental or semi-barbarous people? The very basis and most essential condition of all the

treaties formed during the last two centuries between Western and Eastern Governments, has been the inviolability of the national flag, and the exemption of all who live under its protection from the application of the territorial law without previous intervention of the European authority. When speakers in support of Mr. Cobden's motion therefore drew a parallel between the course of proceedings in Chinese ports and in the ports of any Western Power, and characterised, as something quite monstrous, the glaring contradiction of our ready submission to the municipal laws of the United States or of France, whenever they affected British vessels or subjects within their jurisdiction, and the jealous maintenance of an entire freedom from such jurisdiction in the ports of China, they simply compared things which had nothing in common. In each case we abide by the treaties which regulate the intercourse of independent States. In the one the Powers mutually agree to accept the laws and jurisdiction prevailing in the country, and in the other, that the citizens and vessels of each shall be exempted. Nor is the reason of this distinction any mystery. A certain analogy and similarity of laws and civilisation, with material guarantees for reciprocity and the due administration of justice, makes that consistent with the best interests of both parties in the one case, which in the other would be utterly inadmissible and destructive, because all these conditions are wanting.

We have not touched upon another plea, which has been set up rather to damage the British authorities than with any serious idea, we believe, of constituting a valid defence for Yeh. We allude to supposed illicit dealings and abuses of all kinds under the flag, and to the objectionable character of the colonial legislation on the subject. Irregularities and abuses more than enough we dare say really exist. The ordinance may not be the best measure that could be devised for the purpose — and having once given our flag, we may have shown great carelessness about the uses to which it was converted. Assuming all these things to be as stated, they have nothing whatever to do with the question as it stood between Yeh on the one hand and the British authorities on the other. If such abuses existed, they were grievances of which he might justly have complained. If the ordinance seemed to him faulty, or to assume powers not contemplated in the treaty, or the exercise of which would prove injurious to China, it was open to him to have claimed a revision or redress. But it was not open to any Chinese authority to take the law into his own hands and deny the treaty rights attaching to our flag; and were these grievances ten times more than they actually are, they would afford not

the slightest justification or ground of extenuation to the Chinese commissioner.

As to the second question,—our right of entrance into Canton, and the opportunity or otherwise of the moment chosen to revive it, together with the incidental inquiry as to Sir John Bowring's authority under his instructions to take such a step with all the consequences attaching to it,—these are points on which we must be prepared for much difference of opinion. Judged by the event, it is clear enough that Sir John Bowring, Admiral Seymour, and Mr. Consul Parkes must all have made a miscalculation either as to the enemy's position and means of resistance or as to their own means of coercion. But we think it should in justice be said, that all the accounts from the spot lead us to infer, if an error in judgment was committed in a military point of view, that the error was founded on convictions very generally shared by the foreign residents, long familiar with the place and the people, and who had the best means of information. Finally, whatever decision may be come to as regards the policy of mixing the two questions, there can, we think, be no doubt, that Her Majesty's Government had the right to raise this question, and press it to a conclusion whensoever they might see fit. If the right to enter the city was doubtful by the wording of the treaty, it was never so in reference to the spirit, and the obvious tendency and intent of our exclusion from that one city; that tendency, and the *animus* which dictated and maintained the injurious restriction, sufficed to give us the right to insist on the removal of an exclusion incompatible with the whole tenor and declared object of that compact. In addition to which, the convention entered into with Sir John Davis in 1847, and ratified by the Emperor, removed all ground of discussion. A further defence has been set up for the Chinese, that the Emperor and his local officers had not the *power* to carry out these conditions: but there is, we think, abundant evidence that it was the *will* only that was wanting.

We come now to consider the coercive measures adopted. When difficulties arise between Western Powers,—and causes of dispute are unfortunately frequent enough, whether by violations of treaty rights emanating from Governments, or from the indiscretion or violence of delegated authorities,—we are told the course sanctioned by international law and usage is, first to endeavour to obtain redress by personal representations and remonstrance addressed to the authorities on the spot; and in the event of failure, by similar steps at the seat of Government, and an appeal to the Sovereign Power. A very proper course, no doubt; but one thing is essential to its adoption,

namely, that it should be practicable, that the local authorities or parties offending should be accessible; or, even failing this, that the Government of the aggrieved parties should have ready and established means of satisfactory intercourse, and direct communication, with the Sovereign Power. It has, however, pleased China, this two hundred years, to deny these conditions to all European Powers; and even the imperial commissioner and delegate of the Emperor, expressly deputed to maintain friendly relations, acting under the same senseless and barbaric system, shuts himself within the walls of a city to which all access is denied. By this one act so pertinaciously adhered to, in the face of all experience of its danger, the Empire is put out of the category of States entitled to claim observance of the usages and the reciprocal obligations of international law; and when disputes, violences, or breaches of treaty occur, no alternative is left to Western Powers, if the necessity is imposed upon them of obtaining redress, but acts of reprisal and war,—all more peaceable means being denied by this suicidal policy. The Chinese Government create the obstacles to such free intercourse as is needed to obviate these disasters, and they alone are responsible for the consequences. Whenever reparation for injury or insult cannot be obtained without recourse to force, the nature of the measures adopted, and the extent to which warlike operations should be carried, must have some relation to the nature and amount of the resistance offered; and many purely local and military conditions, of which, we apprehend, it must at all times be exceedingly difficult, at a distance of ten thousand miles, and with imperfect data, to form a very decided opinion. If Napoleon, writing to his brother Joseph at Madrid, felt ‘it was not competent for him to decide upon the details of a campaign at a distance of 1000 leagues,’ we may with great certainty conclude, it is at least as incompetent for a majority of the House of Commons to pass a sweeping censure upon a system of coercion, or a plan of military operations carried on in the river of Canton against a Chinese provincial authority and an inveterately hostile populace, or pronounce judgment upon the loss of life and destruction of property attending such operations.

Objection has, in the last place, been taken to the hostile measures adopted, as uncalled for and wholly unwarranted by the nature or degree of injury and wrong committed. For the resort to force at all, there is of course, in Mr. Cobden’s view, a want of justification; but he says we lay ourselves open to the charge of having one law for the East and another for the West; one course of proceeding for great States and another for small; that we are bullies to the weak, while we truckle to

the strong. God forbid, that as a nation we should be justly chargeable with anything so despicable and so wicked! Let us see what our policy and course of proceeding in China has been, with a view to determine whether Mr. Cobden has any shadow of reason for a charge so sweeping and grave.

There is undoubtedly *a difference* in our mode of dealing with Easterns generally and with the great Powers in Europe; but it is the difference imposed by an essential difference of conditions, and not a matter of choice or shifting morality. We could never better afford to treat with scorn such baseless imputations as these, than at the close of a deadly struggle, in which, for objects affecting the peace and security of Europe rather than our own immediate interests, we entered into war on a gigantic scale, and with the greatest military Power in the world for our adversary. The truth is very apparent to all who honestly seek it. England puts up with more injury and insult in a single month from such a Power as China, which plainly cannot meet her in the field, than she would tolerate for a single day under circumstances of nearer equality. And as regards the East, and China more especially, it is a serious question, and likely to be more seriously regarded now than ever, whether such sufferance and forbearance be either politic, humane, or justifiable? Whether it does not, on the contrary, tend to feed the very sources of war, by fostering the arrogant and ignorant delusions of a semi-barbarous race, too ignorant to appreciate all our elements of strength and superiority, and too fanatically hostile to all of European origin to believe that such forbearance *can* arise from anything but the most sordid or pusillanimous motives; and thus in the end, lead to measures far more costly and destructive, and more injurious to the interests of both races, than a policy founded on a principle of prompt and determined assertion at all times of the rights of nations, whenever they are disregarded by such a people.

Nothing can be more certain than that the long impunity enjoyed by the Cantonese, both authorities and people, in a never-ending series of petty outrages and contumelious acts, and in the assertion of preposterous claims to deal with and consider us as barbarians, has materially contributed to the state of things we have now to deplore at that port, and to the necessity forced upon us, of effectually putting an end, now and for ever, to these extravagant pretensions. We do not believe there is a doubt in the minds of any who have ever had the means of personal observation, afforded by long service or residence in the country, that our unsatisfactory position in China is mainly due to our

long tolerance of 'Cantonese pretensions; or that the moment we disabuse the Chinese in general, of the notion that the city is impregnable and its people invincible, we shall not be far from obtaining whatsoever we may justly demand elsewhere. But our conviction is strong, that *without this*, not even the capture of Peking would make our position what it should be. It is essential to this end, that the Canton question should be settled at once, and *per se*, such settlement being the stepping-stone to all further objects—the stepping-stone without which we shall find it impossible, by any effort ten times more costly, to make a single step on the right road. And let us observe, in conclusion, that not only all past and dear-bought experience clearly indicates this as the only true policy—but the Court of Peking, by the last accounts, lends itself to this solution, in its desire to localise the grounds of quarrel, which is even more its interest than ours.

The importance of our right of entrance into Canton is not to be estimated by any increased facilities for trade it would secure, for these may be trifling or doubtful, but in the increased facilities for maintaining those pacific relations on which all trade depends; in the extinction of a constant source of danger, irritation, and misunderstanding, amounting to a perpetual menace of war; and finally, by the removal of the most insuperable bar to improvement in the relations, commercial or political, of all the Western Powers with the Chinese.

The gravity of these events, and the immediate necessity they impose of vigorous, prompt, and well-directed efforts to bring these deplorable hostilities with a turbulent, conceited, but unwarlike race to an end, and place our relations on an improved and we hope on a more permanent footing, all tend to impress upon us the importance of arriving at right conclusions respecting the people with whom we have to deal.

This naturally leads us to the inquiry referred to at the commencement of these remarks, as to the necessary conditions of our intercourse with the Chinese; in which the peculiarities of the people, their government and civilisation, must enter largely, if we would arrive at an intelligible and practicable result.

It appears, upon the maturest consideration of the whole history of our relations with China, past and present, that the first and chief cause of all difficulty—the *fons et origo malorum*—is to be sought in the fundamental dogma of the Chinaman's political creed,—a delusion, a lie, and the most baseless of all preposterous assumptions—namely, the universal Supremacy of the Emperor of China as the sole representative of Supreme power in the world! This monstrous fallacy draws

much of its force from what is worst and weakest in human nature,—ignorance, indiscriminating pride of race, and love of domination. But as if this were not enough to give currency and vitality to error, it also draws no small support from some of the better and nobler sources of national life. It is connected with loyalty, reverence for superior authority, an almost superstitious love of past greatness, and the elements of order, as the traditions of twice ten centuries have handed them down from the most revered Chinese philosophers and statesmen—Confucius, Mencius, and a few other distinguished men to whose memory they pay a kind of religious worship.

Their ignorance of the claims of European civilisation to respect, and exaggerated notions of the unapproachable superiority of their own, is indeed a fruitful source of evil to both races, and they mutually feed and sustain each other, until the inaptness of the Chinese to learn or profit by any means of better information which continued intercourse brings within their reach, is one of the most discouraging of the conditions attending all efforts at improvement. Whoever takes the trouble to look closely into the history of foreign intercourse with the Chinese, must see this one result plainly written in every transaction: submission, endurance under wrong, and patience under insult, have invariably led to the aggravation of all these evils; while, on the other hand, in no one instance has a well-considered and determined resistance to treatment in every way unjustifiable, failed to ensure greater respect and forbearance on their part, and improvement for a time in the relations which followed. The principle, then, so stoutly contended for in the late debates on China, that resistance to wrong, and a demand for reparation, backed by coercive measures if denied, could only have the result of embittering already existing feuds, and rendering the renewal of more friendly relations impossible, is a conclusion at variance with all past experience, and with all the facts elicited by similar occurrences. Similar in kind, if not in degree, since that intercourse began by Capt. Wardell, who with his two or three ships, in self-defence and resentment for a treacherous design to sink him by a masked battery, stormed and took the batteries with which he had been menaced, and obtained all that he had before *in vain solicited* in the way of fair trade. All temporising and delay is of baneful influence. Six months' reprieve to a Chinaman from the consequences of an act is equivalent to total immunity, more especially in the case of authorities perpetually subject to change from one post to another; and the chance of some future prospective punishment or danger exercises no salutary influence

whatever upon any of them. They are perfect children in this respect. Thus it is that the Cantonese, both the people and their rulers, have fed and grown strong upon our mistaken sufferance of injuries, and batted upon the impunity so constantly enjoyed at our cost.

That we may not be supposed, however, by impartial readers, to overstate the case, and to deal harshly or unfairly by the Chinese, we will turn to Mr. Meadows' book for some conclusive evidence, premising that he is evidently an unwilling witness against the Chinese — devoting the greater part of a bulky volume to establish the claims of the Chinese to be considered a highly civilised people, and that he is anything but satisfied with the treatment they frequently receive at the hands of foreign Powers, or the policy which is pursued—if policy it can be called, where no definite principles are systematically adhered to among them. Engaged in active service since the close of the last war, often confidentially employed in exploring expeditions, a proficient in the language, and evidently a laborious student as well as an active and conscientious officer, it is impossible to appeal to any witness better entitled to speak with authority, or one on whose evidence of all that has come within his observation more implicit reliance may be placed. He has now written a very valuable sequel to his 'Desultory Notes,' a shorter and less pretending work, which appeared some years ago, and both are full of interesting and original matter. We wish that to his other claims to our praise and respect he had added one the public can ill dispense with—the art of making a readable book. It must have required some ingenuity, to put in so unattractive and unpopular a form, materials more than enough to secure, if differently handled, very general attention and interest.

We turn to him first for the results of his experience as to Chinese mendacity; and our readers will see that our witness, while bearing the most unhesitating testimony to the fact, yet finds a reason why we should not judge them harshly, or from a purely European point of view.

'I have observed among Chinese who could speak no English, and many of whom had, at the time I met them, never before conversed with foreigners, so much falsehood, that I make it a rule never to trust to what a Chinese says, even on subjects apparently the most indifferent, unless I have some grounds for so doing. What I am told by them I remember only as something that has been told me, always waiting for corroboration of some kind before giving credence to their tale; and a little acquaintance with the Chinese is sufficient to make most people act thus. Yet the Chinese who have inducements to deceive, when they think their friend is ignorant of the

matter in question, or perceive he can scarcely discover the fact with certainty, having no scruples of conscience to make their minds uneasy, lie so unhesitatingly, with such a perfect air of candour, and if doubted, know so well how to assume an appearance of wounded feeling, that the firmest convictions of those who have had most experience of their character, are occasionally apt to be shaken, while those who know little of the people are made to doubt the evidence of their own senses.

‘The reader, therefore, if he ever have dealings with the Chinese, and would not be duped, must place no reliance on their bare assertions; at the same time, I must particularly warn him against undervaluing them, or treating individuals among them with contempt, on account of this want of veracity. It must be remembered that man does not, when sincerity appears to hurt his own interests, speak the truth naturally, but must be taught to do it by a careful education. Now, as above said, the doctrines of the Chinese sages, though inculcating much morality, lay little or no stress on a rigid adherence to truth, while according to Confucius a lie told by a child to benefit a parent is meritorious. The Christian religion, on the contrary, continually places truth among the virtues, and lying among the lowest vices. By it a lie is *never* praiseworthy; hence we are fully justified in considering a Christian who tells lies as worthless, and capable of any meanness; but we should commit a capital error if we applied the same standard in judging of the Chinese. There are among them as many individuals of high and firm principles, that is to say, of men whom no consideration, not even the fear of death itself, would induce to do what is mean in *their* estimation, as among many, perhaps among any Christian nation. Of this their history contains numberless proofs, which are fully corroborated by a little personal experience of their character.’ (P. 214-6.)

Again, as to the inveterate and incurable ignorance of western nations, there is the same evidence of the fact, with a similar plea of extenuation.

‘There seems to be an idea now somewhat prevalent in England, that the Chinese generally have, in consequence of the late war, attained a much more correct knowledge of foreigners and the power and state of their countries than formerly. This is, however, very far from being the case. Those who saw and felt us, though sufficient in number to populate a first-rate European kingdom, form but a very small portion of the Chinese people; and the great body of the nation, inhabiting districts and provinces that we have never yet reached, can only look on the late war as a rebellious irruption of a tribe of barbarians, who, secure in their strong ships, attacked and took some places along the coast, and even managed to get into their possession an important point of the grand canal, whereby they forced the Emperor to make them certain concessions. Nearly all they know of the fighting and of the character of the invading forces, they must have learned from the mandarins’ reports to the Emperor,

and his answers to them, published in the "Pekin Gazette," and from copies of local proclamations which may have reached them. We may easily imagine, from the tone of these papers, that the Chinese, who, from want of experience, would be unable to form sound judgments on such matters from *correct* data, must entertain opinions on the subject as erroneous as the accounts in these documents are distorted.*

'It will be difficult for the Englishman, who is in the habit of obtaining speedy and correct information through the newspapers of all unusual occurrences, not only in his own, but in nearly every country in the world, to comprehend this fully; but he must remember that the Chinese have (with the single exception of the "Pekin Gazette," containing nothing but official documents full of misrepresentations) no newspapers, and that the great body of the nation have no means of learning what passes at a distance from their own township. This is a circumstance which must always be kept in view when reflecting on and drawing conclusions with regard to China and the Chinese, as it accounts for much that will otherwise appear extraordinary.' (P. 228, 229.)

'All Chinese who have seen them, are perfectly ready to allow that our ships, our guns, watches, cloths, &c., are much superior to their own articles of the like sort; and most of them would frankly admit us to be superior to them in all respects if they thought so. But, as above said, they do not. They are quite unable to draw conclusions as to the state of foreign countries from an inspection of the articles produced or manufactured in them. They cannot see that a country where such an enormous, yet beautiful fabric as a large English ship is constructed—an operation requiring at once the united efforts of numbers, and a high degree of skill—*must* be inhabited by a people not only energetic, but rich and free to enjoy the fruits of its own labour; that such a country *must*, in short, have a powerful government, good laws, and be altogether in a high state of civilisation. All this the Chinaman, having never compared the various states of different nations, is not only quite unable to perceive of himself, but often not even when it is pointed out to him at great length. We have, it is true, the power to do some great and extraordinary things, but so have the elephants and other wild animals he occasionally sees and hears of; in his eyes, therefore, we are all barbarians, possessing perhaps some good qualities, congregated perhaps together in ~~some~~ sort of societies, but without regular government, untutored, coarse, and wild.' (P. 234, 235.)

Of the effect of these convictions on the policy of the Chinese Government and the minds of the ruling powers, the following conversation affords a curious example, and there seems no reasonable doubt of its authenticity.

* The people in and around Canton *now confidently believe* that, although we beat the regular soldiers during the war, their own volunteer corps could expel us from the country.

'I venture to put the following in print as the record of some conversations about the English that took place in Peking on the 24th, 25th, 26th, and 27th days of October, 1849, between the late Chinese Emperor Taou kwang and his mandarin Pih kwei, the then Criminal Judge of the province of Kwang tung.'

'*Emperor.* Then Seu kwang tsin has never employed any of the persons employed by Ke ying? These few years past the barbarian affairs have almost frightened Ke ying to death. The people who have assisted him in their transaction have done nothing but overrate the importance of these matters, so that Ke ying, constantly getting frightened, and listening to all their talk, extended the great fame of the barbarians.'

'*Emperor.* You [Seu and I's party] settled all these affairs. It appears to me that the barbarians depend entirely on Kwang tung for gaining their livelihood.

'*Answer.* The people of Kwang tung thoroughly see that the barbarians cannot do without that province.

'*Emperor.* Exactly so. What others are employed in the transaction of barbarian affairs?

'*Answer.* The expectant intendants; Hieu tscang kwang and Woo tsung yaou [Howqua].

'*Emperor.* Have the English barbarians of late been reduced in power or not?

'*Answer.* They appear to be somewhat reduced.

'*Emperor.* Do the soldiers at Hong Kong amount to three or four thousand?

'*Answer.* Not more than two or three thousand, the greater half of whom are really but nominal. The greater half of the green clothed soldiers [Ceylon Rifles?] have dispersed on account of the insufficiency of the funds for the troops. Trade does not flourish at Ningpo, and those ports.

'*Emperor.* I have heard that it is not good at Ningpo and Amoy, and at Shanghai too. From this we see that prosperity is always followed by decay.

'*Answer.* The English barbarians were in a bad state last year in their own country, where they were visited by an epidemic; and in Hong Kong last year upwards of a thousand people died from the hot exhalations.

'*Emperor.* In all affairs prosperity is followed by decay! What avails the power of man!

'*Answer.* Your Majesty's divine fortune is the cause [of the decay of the English power].

'*Emperor.* You are a bannerman, one born and brought up in the capital, and must know the common saying of the old women: A thousand schemes, ten thousand schemes [of man] are not worth one scheme of Old Heaven.'

'*Emperor.* Do you think from the appearance of things in Kwang tung that the English barbarians or any other people will cause trouble again?

'*Answer.* No. England itself has got nothing, and when the

English barbarians rebelled in 1841 they depended entirely on the power of the other nations who, with a view to open trade, supported them with funds. In the present year the [Here follow two words which do not make sense with the context, "teen te," literally, "laws and territory;" probably "subject territories" were the words used] of England yield her no willing obedience.

' "Emperor. It is plain from this that these barbarians always look on trade as their chief occupation; and are wanting in any high purpose of striving for territorial acquisitions.

' "Answer. At bottom they belong to the class of brutes; (dogs and horses;) it is impossible they should have any high purpose.

' "Emperor. Hence in their country they have now a woman, now a man as their prince (wang). It is plain they are not worth attending to. Have they got like us any fixed time of service for their soldier's head, Bonham?

' "Answer. Some are changed once in two years, some once in three years. Although it is the prince of these barbarians who sends them, they are, in reality, recommended by the body of their merchants." (P. 127, 133.)

After this, we feel the more disposed to give credit to Abbé Huc's description of the convictions of many in the interior of China who think the British are a species of amphibious animals who cannot live long out of their ships or away from the water.

As to the character and amount of civilisation which the Chinese have attained, and of the education generally diffused among them,—points of some importance in considering the best means of extending our relations,—space will not allow us to go into the question further than to call attention to one observation of Mr. Meadows, who has devoted a whole chapter to the facts and arguments illustrating this subject. He considers that they have many of the characteristics of a cultivation high in kind but low and superficial in degree. In the accuracy of this conclusion we are upon the whole disposed to concur, with this proviso, that as regards our own relations with the Chinese, this very lowness in the degree of their social culture has attached to it some of the worst consequences of lowness in kind—the necessity of employing physical instead of intellectual or moral agencies, as the only effective means of controlling their hostile tendencies, based on ignorance and prejudice. The observation we allude to is the following:—

' The peace doctrines of the Quakers, and the efforts of the peace party in British politics, all proceed from a lack of power to see, that the most civilised nations are still very far from being sufficiently cultivated in their moral faculties, to admit of the efficient substitution of moral for intellectual or physical agencies in man's struggles with man.'

And this again :—

‘What is, in common language, called “accommodating oneself to the prejudices” of individuals; “or showing a prudent respect” for strange customs and peculiar habits of thought or for moral characteristics of nations, is nothing but, 1st, a just appreciation of the intellectual and moral development of the individuals or nations; and 2ndly, the right employment, in each case, of precisely those agencies of civilisation which are fitted to be most effective.’

In this last sentence lies, we conceive, the true principle of all rational policy in the dealings of foreign Powers with the Chinese — a policy founded on a large and accurate knowledge of the intellectual and moral development of the people to be dealt with, and the right employment of those agencies of civilisation *which are fitted to be most effective*. Now we yield to no one in the preference to be given to moral agencies over either the intellectual or the physical, both as a means of civilisation and of government; for as the physical are the lowest in the scale, so are they the least desirable, and subject to the greatest drawbacks on any success which may be achieved by their use. But there must be a corresponding fitness in all such cases between the agencies employed and the people on whom they are brought to bear.

It was this, no doubt, to which Lord Clarendon adverted when he said we must speak to them in the only language to which, for our misfortune and theirs, they would listen, or could be made to understand. His Lordship was attacked as if he had enounced some principle shocking to the finer feelings of this civilised age. Lord Clarendon’s view was nevertheless that of a statesman well versed in the necessary conditions of any successful maintenance of the interests and the just rights of his country in China, and of one who rightly deemed that the interests of civilisation and of humanity demand the employment of those agencies which are alone fitted to ensure the attainment of a just and legitimate end.

The basis of our future intercourse thus understood will be the determination to claim whatever we may justly and reasonably demand as between nation and nation; to be content with nothing less; and when once a right is distinctly recognised by the stipulations of a treaty, to allow no wilful violation, or systematic action for the nullification of the objects contemplated by such treaty, to pass unnoticed or to be persisted in with impunity. If the Chinese, warned by all past experience and by the more recent events at Canton, can be induced, in their own interest no less than ours, to renounce a system of isolation no longer applicable to the position in which China stands

regards western nations, and to allow that free and direct intercourse with the Government at Peking and the provincial authorities at Canton, which has become a necessity, and thus take their place among civilised nations, a totally different state of affairs will be the result. By this one act they would in a great degree improve their own position with foreign States when grievances or causes of quarrel arise, and they would afford to those foreign States the means of appealing with reason and argument direct to the head of the Chinese Government, in order to obtain redress before any other action takes place.

In the meantime and until this change shall be effected, acts of reprisal and coercive means, applied to the provincial authorities who refuse redress for acts of violence and aggression, are the only alternative left to us for our protection.

Taking this principle of action as a groundwork, our future policy in China must, of course, have especial reference to our wants, and not only our own wants, but those of other foreign Powers; and when clearly defined, it will be necessary to inquire how far these wants are consistent with the rights of the Chinese and with each other; how far they are compatible with existing conditions and the political state of China,—the mutual relations of rulers and people,—the degree and kind of their civilisation,—the ignorance, fears, prejudices, and traditions, by which both the governors and the governed are reciprocally influenced and controlled.

It is very plain, that to aim at objects wholly unattainable collectively, or individually incompatible with each other, is to peril all. Our first labour therefore should be to apply this test to our own objects of pursuit or desire, and subsequently to the wants and desires of other foreign Powers.

What do we want with China? Of Great Britain and the United States of America it may be unhesitatingly answered, their object is one,—COMMERCE. And this primary object of all intercourse, mutually consistent as between the two foreign Powers, is also, fortunately, not incompatible with the wants of the Chinese, or the will of their rulers. For this great end of commerce, both parties would find advantage in freer access to the first markets, especially to the tea and silk-producing districts, and in direct and freer intercourse with the rulers of the Empire, from Peking to Canton. To these concessions there do not appear to be any insuperable obstacles.

But England and America—and we must add France—have added to these declared treaty-objects a rider in the form of a supplementary want or desire, which is not very compatible with the great primary object,—not compatible at all

unless entirely subordinated to it. We allude to their missionary labours, and the desire of converting the Chinese. There are some leading facts of the greatest interest and importance connected with this subject which we desire, as briefly as we may, to bring under the notice of our readers, and to recommend to their serious consideration.

We must premise, that an intuitive fear of foreign aggression and disturbance, based upon the belief that European ideas, religious, political, and social, are in their essence antipathetic to and subversive of the existing institutions and government of the Empire,—and that the introduction of such new and disturbing elements can only be the precursor of violent changes and revolution, to end in the subjugation of the Chinese race,—very generally prevails among the Chinese. And despite of their ignorance and conceit, this fear is increased by a certain sense of weakness when opposed to the Western Powers, and by the incapacity of effective resistance, if schemes of conquest should be entertained. This gives the key to the whole policy of China in its dealings with foreign States.

Let us use this key to open some of the secret sources of their hostility, and their persistent, though covert, resistance to all measures which have for their object greater freedom of intercourse or access to the interior of the empire. *We have seen that the two great maritime States of the Western World desire the same end, as a paramount and in every sense primary object, and plainly have no designs of territorial aggrandisement. This, at least, is one good element of success. And, although they are rivals in trade, it need not be a hostile rivalry, for whatever opens markets to the one, is an advantage secured to the other. Great Britain set an example of sound policy in disclaiming from the beginning all exclusive aims or monopoly of advantages, when it rested with her to dictate the terms of the first treaty at Nanking, which the United States are too enlightened to seek to reverse by following any different course. Both also desire, with commerce, to extend the blessings of a true faith and the benefits of civilisation; but they are equally aware that only in so far as the two national objects—the extension of commerce on the one hand, and Christianity on the other—are consistent, and followed out by means involving no essential contradiction or incompatibility, can they be conjoined with any rational ground of hope that success will be the result of their efforts. They both desire the same form of Christianity,—the Protestant religion giving a certain unity to their conjoint efforts, in design, at least, and removing what otherwise might be a great source of trouble and contradiction;

a danger, unfortunately, which stands somewhat in the way of any efforts that ~~may~~ be made in concert with France, which has taken the Roman Catholic Missions under her especial protection.

But these seeds of internal ~~dissidence~~ are scarcely apparent to the Chinese at present; it is in a political aspect that the proselytising labours of all missionaries are indiscriminately regarded with the strongest feelings of ~~alarm~~ and hostility, and before we go back to an earlier period for evidence of an authentic character on this subject, we may remark that no series of events could possibly have taken place more calculated to operate injuriously against all missionary efforts than the formidable insurrection which was hailed in England and America with a perfect diapason of joy and triumph. These insurrectionary movements have for these five years past spread desolation far and wide, shaken the throne of the present Tartar monarch, and watered with the blood of thousands and of hundreds of thousands the fairest and wealthiest provinces of China, — the insurgents claiming affiliation with Christianity, and putting forward as the ostensible objects of the rebellion the inauguration of that religion, and the extermination of the Tartars — an ominous conjunction for European interests! This is the view taken of the rebellion at Peking, as set forth in a memorial to the Emperor, printed in the 'Pekin Gazette,' and circulated throughout the empire.

'The names of the robbers have all been sought out (the rebel chiefs are here enumerated), who all evidently joined the sect at Kin-tien. The Protestant sect (Shangti) is only another designation of the Roman Catholics, but originating with the barbarians, and flowing in poisonous streams through the middle kingdom, dyeing the customs of the country, and deluding the people; damaging the manners, and wounding the hearts of the age.'

M. Hue has said, and we believe quite rightly, that the Chinese emperors are not intolerant as to religious creeds. He adds, however, the important restrictive words — 'save in so far as they interfere with temporal things,' and among these, as chief and first, their own political rule. He alludes to a proclamation of Taoukwang, the late emperor, in which he passed in review all the religions of which the Chinese had any knowledge, and came finally to the conclusion that they were all equally false, and that his subjects would do well to despise them altogether. This so far corresponds with the best information possessed by foreigners on the subject, that we believe it may be very safely assumed to be true. A Chinese may please his fancy with whatever religion he prefers, provided it is not one connected with secret

societies or political objects. ‘Unfortunately,’ observes M. Huc, ‘the Chinese government has placed Christianity in this category, and it is very difficult to correct this error, and introduce more just ideas.’ Very difficult indeed, we agree with the Abbé, and we should have agreed with him if he had declared it to be simply impossible. What is government, considered from the Chinese point of view? Is it not absolute and undisputed empire—undivided control over their subjects exercised by the occupant of the throne at the time—the Son of Heaven? Is it an error, then to place Christianity in this category? Let us listen to what the Emperor Young-tching thought on the subject; he who in 1724 proscribed the Christian religion, and who graciously condescended to state his views to three Jesuit priests who petitioned him when the decree against them was fulminated:—

‘Certain Europeans* in the province of Fokien have been endeavouring to defy our laws and trouble our people. The great men of the province have applied to me, and I must repress this disorder. It is the business of the Government with which I am charged, and I neither can nor ought to act now as I did when I was a private prince.’

‘You say that your law is not a false law; and I believe it. But what would you say if I were to send a troop of Bonzes and Lamas into your country to preach their law in it? How would you receive them? You wish to make the Chinese Christians, and this is what your law demands, I know very well. *But what in that case would become of us?*—THE SUBJECTS OF YOUR KINGS. *The Christians whom you make recognise no authority but you:* in times of trouble they would listen to no other voice. I know well enough that there is nothing to fear at present; but when your ships shall be coming by thousands and tens of thousands, then indeed we may have some disturbances.’ (*Abbé Huc.*)

Must we not confess that this, upon the whole, was a very natural, and not an irrational view, for the despotic head of a great pagan empire to hold? Can we feel surprised, if a universal opinion, shared by the emperor and the whole class of authorities and literati, should prevail, that the political elements of disturbance are thickly sown with the Christian creed, unsettling the minds of the people, and subverting the national creed of absolute submission to the emperor and his authority? Can we doubt that such a feeling must form one of the greatest obstacles at the present moment to any successful negotiations with the Chinese Government for commercial objects and to pro-

* Spanish Dominicans settled in the province of Fokien.

posals for additional facilities of access to the inland marts and producing districts?

Is it not in effect to introduce into a kingdom or state where another rule exists, a new *primum mobile*, to use the words of Bacon, 'that ravisheth all the spheres of government;' a new principle of action and dominion, with which the law it finds established has no affinity or possible bond of connexion? That is, in this instance, a principle threatening to ravish from the heathen rule all control over their own people by the adoption of principles subversive of the established policy. Such has never been the policy of this country in India or in the other parts of Asia which we have visited or subdued. It is a policy calculated to defeat its own object, and to rouse against us all the fury of religious fanaticism; and whilst we respect the opinions of the missionary leaders in China, we are persuaded that their exertions are often injudicious and premature.

This brings us to the consideration of Russian intervention and antagonism. Russia has a large inland trade with China, and has recently found means of obtaining a treaty for maritime trade, placing her, as regards the latter, on the footing of the most favoured nation, and in other respects considerably in advance of every other Western Power. The treaty which established the fairs of Kiachta and Maimachin on the Mongolian frontier of China dates from 1727. A Russian mission has continued since that time to reside in Peking, under the most humble exterior; but it has not the less ably served the religious interests of the Greek Church, the commercial interests of the overland trade, and even the territorial interests of Russia. Indeed it is not one of the least important circumstances in the present critical state of the Chinese Empire that Russia has acquired a very formidable position on its northern frontier, within a comparatively short distance of Peking itself. Even in the very hour of her defeat in the Crimea, Russia, without noise or *fracas*, found means to advance her boundary to the Amoor and absorb half a province larger than any European kingdom! To Russia it is a commercial and political necessity to gain free access to unfrozen seas; and the superior maritime strength and knowledge displayed by the Russian squadron in the Eastern seas during the late war, is a proof of the attention she has bestowed upon the subject. We care not to insist further upon this point at present; but the information we possess of the recent progress of Russia in China plainly indicates considerable danger in that direction, to European commerce and the free enjoyment of international rights in all the countries and settlements from the Pacific to the Indian Ocean. So far as commerce and its free

development is the first want and paramount object of Great Britain and the United States, it behoves them to unite, and, being forewarned, to be also forearmed, against all contingencies. So far even as France has any interest in China connected with the propagation of the Roman Catholic faith, it behoves her too to beware, and, sinking all minor differences of creed, to join them cordially and earnestly in the policy that may best secure both Europe and China from that which would be destructive to all their objects.

We have said what was most essential as regards the relation of foreign Powers towards each other, and their respective objects in the relations maintained with China. What remains has reference to our own objects and their incompatibility with each other; and in alluding to them we must content ourselves with little more than a mere indication of the leading facts.

England has not only attached to her commerce a Missionary object, which, as we have shown, is singularly inimical to our pacific relations with China, but in what is strictly commercial there is a still more unfortunate conjunction of wholly irreconcilable things, — the sale of opium, as a means of raising an Indian revenue, and providing a very large portion of the funds required for the purchase of tea and silk, the great staples of our Chinese trade. We raise an Indian revenue of some 3,000,000*l.* upon the opium grown under government monopoly; and the value of Chinese commodities received in exchange for the 70,000 chests which yield this revenue, and transmitted to England, covers the balance on the direct trade with India. A very considerable amount of opium, doubtless, thus enters into China. Our raw cotton from India and manufactured goods from England, which find a market there, are, compared with the two principal articles of exchange, opium and bullion, almost insignificant. These goods do not exceed a million and a quarter in value; the raw cotton less than three quarters, — not two millions in the whole, — with which to purchase 70,000,000 lbs. of tea and 50,000 bales of silk, which may be roughly valued respectively at 2,000,000*l.* and 5,000,000*l.*

We do not propose here to enter into any question as to the morality of opium smoking, for the subject is a large one, though we must observe that it is stated in recent reports that not above 3 per cent. of the population of Canton are fatally addicted to this vice, a proportion very far below that of the dram-drinkers in Great Britain; but we have here only to deal with it as a commercial and political question. We see the important part it plays in a trade which involves that of India, where

the population consumes 8,000,000*l.* of British manufactures; and the whole circle cannot be held to represent a commerce of less than 30,000,000*l.* annually. It will be very evident that we are neither ignorant of the share it has in these results, nor disposed to underrate its importance as one of the elements or integers in the sum-total of our interests. There is nevertheless one question which we must put fearlessly:—is the importation of opium, in the present state of Chinese law and public opinion, compatible with the free development of our legitimate trade,—the declared object of our treaty,—with the observance in spirit at least of the conditions of that treaty, or the improvement of our political position and commercial relation with the Chinese Empire? Because if, upon a careful and impartial inquiry into all the facts, the only answer to be rightly given is in the negative,—and it should appear impossible to alter either the law or the treaty,—we will write *incompatible* against it with as little fear or hesitation as we have already done in respect to missionary labours.

In considering the question as one of policy, we must needs take into account the conclusion arrived at by the governors of the country to which the opium is taken,—whether we believe that conclusion correct or otherwise,—as we must also weigh the consideration due to the laws which they enact to prohibit its importation and consumption; because by treaty we have bound ourselves neither to promote or in any way sanction contraband trade, and by all international law and usage the British Government should not only show respect to those laws, but to the extent of its power cause all persons under its authority to respect them; most especially in China, where British subjects are withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the territorial sovereign. We fear this latter circumstance has been too much overlooked by foreign Powers generally who have trading relations with China. On the plea that it is not for a foreign Power to supply a preventive service, or custom-house officers, foreign traders have been allowed to do pretty much as they pleased, these being neither slow to perceive nor in any way reluctant to profit by the corrupt and incompetent administration of customs throughout China. No doubt the circumstances were from the beginning full of difficulty. A corrupt and incapable custom-house administration will of necessity lead to a corresponding looseness in the merchants. It soon amounts to this, that all must trade on a system repugnant to an honourable mind, or those who are scrupulous will be undersold and driven out of the market by others—British or foreign, who allow no scruples to interfere, involving a sacrifice of their interests, if not total ruin.

Certainly the ~~honourable~~ merchant entering into a legitimate trade on the faith of national treaties, should be protected, and not reduced to this alternative.

But under the treaties at present existing, little effort has been made in this direction, if we except the establishment since 1854 of an efficient custom-house administration at Shanghai, under the supervision of a board of foreign inspectors employed by the Chinese Government. For the first time since the treaty of Nanking was signed, the merchant who had any scruples of conscience, and desired to act with good faith, was placed on a footing of equality with him who had neither to embarrass him in his operations. But the impossibility, in the existing state of relations, of inducing the Chinese authorities to extend this system to all the ports, in order that not only at one, but at all, trade might be carried on upon equal terms as to the levy of duties, created so much dissatisfaction on the part of the Shanghai merchants from the higher rate levied there in comparison with other ports, (where a third or a half, or sometimes the whole, of the duties were evaded,) that before the present crisis took place at Canton, orders had already been sent out to advise the Chinese Government of the necessity of either extending an impartial and efficient system of collecting the maritime duties on foreign trade to all the ports, or of abandoning that which had been so completely successful at Shanghai. The opportunity now likely to occur of revising the treaties in force, and placing the whole of our relations on a better footing, will not, we hope, be lost; and as the subject of smuggling (exclusive of the opium traffic) is one of the most serious difficulties in the way of a perfectly satisfactory commercial intercourse, we may as well say all we deem essential on the subject at once.

Existing treaties with China are founded on a double fallacy, as must now be well known; first, that the Chinese Government both had the will and the power to collect all the duties, rigorously and impartially, from vessels under every flag; and secondly, that if they had not, and failed to carry out this stipulation, the loss would be theirs, and not ours: that is, the Chinese revenue, not the foreign merchant, would be the sufferer. Now, in reference to the first point; with differences of language, indisposition to come into violent collision with Europeans on the part of subordinate officials, and lastly, with an all-pervading system of bribery and corruption, inertness, and inaptitude, the thing was plainly impossible; nor was there any rational ground for believing that it could be otherwise. As to the second point, that the revenue would alone suffer by any *laches*, or imperfect and unfair collection of duties on the part of the Chinese; — who

does not see that if one merchant could import or export goods with a payment of one half, or one third of the duties, while another was liable to have the whole amount exacted, these two men could not trade at the same market; and that one would be grievously injured by so unfair and ruinous a difference? But more than this, such a wretched administration would necessarily introduce an element of uncertainty into all trading operations, reducing them to the level of gambling; since no man could tell how much or how little, within a margin of twenty or even thirty per cent., his neighbours would have to pay for the same produce. Are these slight evils to fall on British merchants and British trade? Or what is the loss of a million of revenue to the Chinese Government, compared with the mischief, injury, and confusion of right and wrong inflicted upon the merchant? We have no hesitation in saying that this is a state of things which has long and loudly called for redress at the hands of the Maritime Powers, and no new treaty ought now to be entered into which does not provide a full and efficient remedy.

In what direction shall this be sought? We believe there are but two alternatives. Either to establish a system at all the ports of rigorous and impartial administration under the supervision and control of competent foreign inspectors in the employment of the Chinese Government, akin in its leading features to that which has been in successful operation at Shanghai for nearly three years,—or to abolish all maritime duties, and leave it to the Chinese Government to levy duties on their own subjects, bringing or taking away produce for the foreign markets. The latter would probably be the more acceptable, both to the Chinese Government and to the foreign merchants of every nation, and meet with fewer obstacles to its immediate adoption. But it is open to one serious objection—it is a step backwards, and returning to the system in force before the war in 1841, it throws into the hands of the Chinese Government and officials an unlimited power to tax foreign trade, which it was a very special object of the treaty of Nanking, with its supplement, to provide against, by insisting upon the abolition of all taxes on trade (a trifling transit duty excepted), save those which were specified under a tariff, and levied at the ports under the check of a consular supervision, with a right of appeal on the part of the merchant, if there should be any deviation or extortion. This did not in effect completely tie the hands of the Chinese in regard to inland duties, for they have been perpetually levying different rates under one pretext or other. But perhaps there would be less to fear from this abuse of power

than from the continuance of the existing faulty, vicious, and demoralising mode of partial collection and evasion of duties.

Leaving the general subject of smuggling and custom-house administration, we return to the unrecognised but established traffic in opium all up the coast and at each of the consular ports,—so large in commercial value and so important in revenue to India. Whatever its value, this difficulty lies right in the path of any negotiator with the Chinese Government for improvement in our relations both commercial and political. Rightly or wrongly, wisely or otherwise, the Chinese rulers have prohibited the importation of the drug, condemned its consumption as deleterious, and attached the penalty of death to the infringement of the laws respecting it. It is in the teeth of these laws and denunciations that foreigners, and chiefly the British (for though Americans sell it on the coast, and *under their flag*, a fact their own writers are somewhat apt to forget, only British vessels bring it from India), dispose of some 70,000 chests annually to Chinese subjects on Chinese territory. The evil opium may do the Chinese may be more or less doubtful; at all events, there are two opinions on the subject; but what injury and evil this wholesale disregard of Chinese law brings to us—to our political status and influence in China, is unfortunately anything but doubtful or trivial. It probably does more to lower us morally in the eyes of the Chinese population and officials than any other single cause of prejudice that can be named since our intercourse first began; and it does much, we firmly believe, to cripple us in all efforts to improve our commercial relations. It is said, we know, that unnecessary clamour is made about the sale of opium, on the plea of its being a *contraband* trade, for in effect it is fully sanctioned—tacitly and practically, if not expressly, by all the authorities from Shanghai to Canton. This is only partially true. No active steps are taken to interfere with its introduction into China; but we must not overlook the reason. The Chinese say and believe that in 1841 we went to war in defence of our opium trade; and that we should do so again, on some pretext or other, if they were bold enough to endeavour to compel our people to respect the laws of prohibition. Shall we then take advantage of this feeling to charge them with complicity, or voluntary connivance in the import of opium? It would be but a miserable ground of defence, and we prefer the frank admission of what we believe to be the truth. How shall this untoward state of affairs be amended? That is the question. Here also there would seem but two courses open. The Indian Government must cease to be its producer, and seek its 3,000,000*l.*

revenue from other sources; or the Emperor of China must legalise its importation, with or without a duty, as he may prefer it; but we fear difficulties almost insuperable stand in the way of either measure—certainly of the last. The Emperor would lose caste and character with his own subjects if he recalled existing decrees and took any open step to sanction its importation, even if he accompanied such acts by a denunciation of its injurious use, heavy punishments for cases of abuse, and a declaration of a great economic truth—that the only remedy for the evil, as all experience proves, is *moral* not *legislative*, and that people must cease, from a conviction of its bad effects, to use or demand it, when the supply would cease of itself. The issue of such a manifesto, however, might be reconciled with Chinese views of national morality and policy by the Indian Government undertaking progressively in a given series of years to abandon the cultivation of opium for exportation. And this might be a strong, perhaps an adequate, motive for an effort at accommodation on the part of the Emperor.

While on the subject of grievances against us as traders, we must advert to another branch of the same topic, which in itself furnishes an epitome of the whole, and not only lies at the root of the present quarrel, but in all its ramifications spreads far and wide from the centre, and everywhere creates increased dissatisfaction and new difficulties. We mean Hongkong—its colonial administration and trade—its development as a commercial colony with territorial rights and pretensions—its sailing cutters and lorchas—its piratical guests—its population of outlaws—its fleet of smugglers, passage-boats, and coasting-craft of every denomination.

An attempt was made during the debate to fix upon the Government of this country a charge of flagrant bad faith in making Hongkong a colony at all, by quoting the exact words of the treaty in which it was ceded to us, and endeavouring to restrict its uses to the only purpose publicly assigned for making it over to us—namely, the ‘obvious necessity and ‘desirability’ of British subjects having ‘some port whereat they may careen and refit their ships when required, and keep ‘stores for that purpose.’ Wherefore ‘the island of Hong-kong’ was ceded by the Emperor of China to the Queen of Great Britain, ‘to be possessed in perpetuity by Her Britannic Majesty, her heirs and successors, and to be governed by such ‘laws and regulations as Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain, &c., shall see fit to direct.’

Does the right honourable member for the University of Oxford honestly believe that any such absurd and untenable limitation

of purposes and uses was contemplated, by *either* contracting party, when ~~the~~ treaty was signed? This article of the treaty has a necessary connexion with others, more especially in the supplementary treaty, where distinct provision is made for *trading relations with Hongkong*, and the licensing of *lorchas* and other small craft for its conduct. Now there is no principle of international law ~~and right~~ better established than this, that the provisions of a treaty are to be interpreted, not by reference to the mere wording only; account must be taken of the object and intention which dictated the terms, especially when these can be plainly demonstrated; and that single clauses have a necessary connexion with others, and must be considered as a whole; and only thus can they be rightly interpreted, or their true meaning understood. Viewed in this broad and equitable sense, no one can deliberately maintain, that because in Article.III. of this Treaty, allusion is only made to one of the several purposes which rendered this cession 'obviously necessary and desirable,' and for the purpose very manifestly of avoiding unnecessary humiliation and injury to the popularity of the sovereign ceding—a result which would have been as mischievous to us as to the emperor,—that it was intended by the contracting parties to preclude us, or that we were in effect precluded by international law and usage, from making it in every sense of the term a British colony. But we do not hesitate to say, that we *were* bound, by the whole spirit and interest of both treaties, and by national good faith, to take due care that in any steps we might take for the establishment of a colony of a mercantile character, and the exercise of our undoubted sovereignty and territorial rights over it, no just cause of offence or alarm should be given to China. We wish we could take the same high ground of vindication in this as in the refutation of the frivolous charge of violation of treaties in making it a colony at all. We cannot be untrue to our convictions, however, and the information we possess leads to a very opposite conclusion.

As a military outpost at the mouth of the Canton river, a refitting port for our ships and men of war, and a place of security for our merchants to flee to in time of need, ~~and~~ at all times to store their merchandise in free, of port charges or duties, Hongkong was very obviously 'necessary and desirable.' As a colony for the *creation of a revenue*, and the development of a supplementary kind of commerce of a mongrel character, in which the chief agents must be Chinese, claiming to be quasi British subjects by right of domicile, and yet natural born and unalienable Chinese subjects; and whose trade would in the nature of things be of a very questionable,

if not illicit character, it could only prove a thorn in the side of China—a harbour for outlaws and smugglers—a perpetual blister and a festering sore in her flank, tending to create a sense of increasing irritation and hostility, and fatal to the extension and improvement of that great commerce with China and the Mother Country, for which we made a national war and concluded solemn treaties,—and for the advancement and protection of which, we claimed and took possession of an island on the Chinese coast. The bantling we reared and maintained for the sole benefit of a vast and profitable national trade, has mistaken its destiny, and devoted all its energies to a little speculation on its own account, consisting mainly of illicit and unjustifiable traffic with consular ports and places along the whole coast, with which we can have by treaty no direct intercourse or trading relations: and clapping its wings ever and anon, crows aloud,—‘ See what great things I am doing; I have made a very nice thing of my own; I am besides helping you enormously, and I cost you nothing. Nay, last year I sent you a present of 3000*l. surplus revenue*!’ Has it indeed cost us nothing? Does it, *will* it cost us nothing, now and hereafter, if persevered in? What it has cost us is clear enough, too plain, indeed, to admit of question. It has cost us ill-will, distrust, and perpetually increasing hostility on the part of the Chinese rulers, whom it is our *interest* above all other things, if possible to conciliate, if we would either preserve one of the largest sections of our foreign trade, or extend and develop this trade, to the increasing benefit of two of the greatest empires in the world. It has cost us more than we like to estimate, in character, in the eyes of those with whom it is our paramount interest to stand well,—to be respected as well as feared. It has had something—much, to do with the cost of a new war—the destruction of a great trading city, the commerce of which was as a great river, compared with the puny interests of Hongkong. We had and have one great interest in China—a trade of some thirty millions sterling annually—a British revenue of six millions, independent of an Indian revenue of three, with a field and a capacity of development of which it would be difficult to fix the limits. And was this a thing to be damaged and jeopardized by the miserable and paltry part which Hongkong could legitimately play; or still worse (in our opinion), by the unjustifiable part which it has been seeking for twelve years past to play, by the most illegitimate means? But if there was an idea of creating for Hongkong a destiny that should rival Singapore, it was a

blunder in another sense. Why has Singapore become the great centre of a flourishing and ever increasing commerce? Because geographically and politically it was admirably situated for that purpose, in the centre of a great archipelago of populous and semi-civilised colonies and adjacent states, from the Philippine Islands to Australia, with Borneo, Java, and Sumatra on either side, — Singapore being midway in the great channel of commercial interchanges between the western world and the eastern for the supply of these untold populations with European manufactures, and the collection of the natural products of the Eastern Archipelago, from which Europe draws its whole supply of valuable woods, gums, spices, and innumerable other articles, — Singapore, by natural advantages of position, was from the first moment in that exceptional and enviable position which Venice, in the days of her greatest glory, held — the commercial link between a western and an eastern world. What possible identity of condition can be traced in Hongkong? A barren and sterile island, broken off from the coast of a vast empire which is, to an unprecedented degree, self-sufficing and industrial, and with which we had direct trading relations, and ports assigned for all legitimate commerce with Europe or the rest of the world. It was obvious then, or should have been so from the hour of its creation as a British possession, that it had but one profitable and lawful destiny, — to be an outpost of safety for the protection and defence of the great and international trade between China and Great Britain; and just in proportion as the delusion was entertained of making it a commercial and revenue-creating colony, it became a source of injury and of danger to that trade, and those interests, political and commercial, for which alone it was constituted a British possession.

It will now be very evident that from this error are to be traced some of the complications, hostilities, and obstacles that beset us at present in China. With a population of sixty thousand Chinese subjects — for such they are whenever they tread the Chinese territory, whatever rights of naturalisation or domicile we may give them — not of the choicest class either; actively engaged in a river and coasting trade, and in such close vicinity to the mainland — it is hard to devise any system of legislation, maritime or territorial, that will keep them free from reproach as regards the rights of the Chinese Government and revenue, and our own duties towards that Government in an international sense. The British flag, however bestowed, will be often ill employed; its proper use cannot be so guarded by legislative enactment that it will not lead to gross abuses. It

is perhaps the less important therefore to examine in any detail what has been the course of our colonial legislation and our administration of justice among this stirring, ever-changing, and eastern population. But if we were to give our own impression, it would be that nothing could well be worse, or more ill-adapted to the professed ends of good government. If we give our flag, — and one of the privileges of that flag, under treaty, is to exempt those who sail under it from the direct interference or jurisdiction of the territorial authorities of an empire with which we maintain friendly relations, — one thing at least is very clear, that we incur, by the very act of conferring such privilege, the solemn obligation of ourselves watching, and taking effective means to prevent its being abused or prostituted to illegal purposes. Have we made any effort to do this? We will not say there has been no intention to do so, but it can hardly be doubted, from all that has lately transpired on the subject, that there has been failure somewhere in carrying it out.

Then, as to the administration of law in the colony. The one great danger to be guarded against was that a British colony in the immediate vicinity of the populous coast of China should become an *Alsatia* of refuge for all the outlaws and conspirators of the mainland — the resort of pirates who devastate the coast, — and their port of predilection for refitting and rearming, where men, arms, and ammunition the best adapted for their lawless purposes could always be obtained at the lowest cost. It is unfortunately notorious that such is the case; and our laws or their administrators are wholly and hopelessly powerless to deal with this monster evil. The very pirate fleets which our men-of-war from time to time have either blown up or captured are usually found armed with English guns of the best construction, and supplied with English or European powder. Finally, as these 60,000 Chinese, among other virtues and vices, are much given to litigation, and a little to overreaching, thieving, and such indulgences, and as many are very shrewd, talkative, and clever fellows, having constant and frequent communication with the mainland, it would seem very desirable that there should be that in the administration of our laws, and in the laws themselves, calculated to impress Chinese plaintiffs and defendants at least, if not criminals, with respect for our ability to frame laws having some sort of reference to an almost exclusively Chinese population — some kind of adaptation to the circumstances to which they are to be applied; and that as to laws, forms of procedure, and administration, there should be some adaptation of means to the end, and a fitness and harmony in all the parts of the legal machinery. We think

this would be a reasonable expectation on their part, and a desirable arrangement as regards our own interests and national character. We wish we could see any evidence of this clearness of principle and fitness of procedure. There is a Supreme Court, most costly and elaborate in its constitution, with a Chief Judge on the Bench, Attorney-General, barristers and attorneys. But anything more cumbersome, unmanageable, or elaborately intricate and ill-contrived for the administration of justice — with all the forms and technicalities of the Court of Chancery and the Courts of Law combined, — it would be very difficult to conceive.

The supplementary treaty endeavoured to make some provision for the effectual regulation of small class vessels passing to and fro between Hongkong and the mainland; but it was inadequate, and rendered totally nugatory by one characteristic of the Chinese officials in all their dealings with us, which requires to be ever borne in mind, and unfortunately makes the task of placing our treaty relations on a satisfactory footing for both parties exceedingly difficult — their constant practice, either for their own individual ends, or in obedience to their general policy, of converting any right or privilege of interference conceded to them in the interests of order and legality, into an instrument of corruption or oppression, to the detriment of our most legitimate rights and interests. The use conceded to these officials, as in the case of the flag to their subjects, invariably leads to abuse. This is one of the greatest difficulties we have to contend with. An administration, universally corrupt and venal, a readiness to make all legitimate authority a mere instrument of profit, where mendacity and bad faith is the rule, are conditions not easily to be dealt with. How shall we devise a treaty so that good and permanent relations can be maintained? For after all, engagements between nations may either be absolute or conditional, but most generally they are necessarily the latter; and the obligation of conditional engagements must not unfrequently be those of *reciprocity* in the faithful performance of some corresponding engagements. And so it is especially in our treaty with China as regards the collection of maritime customs. It has been asked in both Houses of Parliament, and papers have been moved for to the same end — whether *we* have performed the part which the treaty-regulations stipulate that we shall perform by vigilantly watching over our own subjects, to prevent or denounce irregularities or smuggling? But this assumes that the Chinese Government would, on its part, take proper means to collect these duties fully and impartially at all

the ports and upon the ships of all flags,—an obligation altogether ignored by them, and a task, in the performance of which they have showed themselves as indifferent as they seemed incompetent.

To have performed our part strictly in such conditions under these circumstances, would have been to drive our flag from those seas, and to destroy the commerce, the maintenance of which was the sole object of the treaty—an act of suicide which neither nations nor individuals could be called upon to commit at the behest of any power. So again, in reference to the papers to which inquiry has been directed, with a view of proving that we have violated treaty conditions, as regards the small craft coasting trade. What are the facts? By Article XIII. of the Supplemental Treaty, it is provided that

‘All persons, whether natives of China or otherwise, who may wish to convey goods from any one of the five ports to Hongkong, for sale or consumption, shall be at full and perfect liberty to do so on paying the duties on such goods, and obtaining a pass or port clearance from the Chinese Custom House. Should natives of China wish to repair to Hongkong, to purchase goods, they shall have free and full permission to do so; and should they require a Chinese vessel to carry away their purchases, they must obtain a pass, or port clearance, for her at the Custom House of the port whence the vessel may sail for Hongkong. It is further settled that in all cases these passes are to be returned to the officers of the Chinese Government, as soon as the trip for which they may be granted shall be completed.’

And Article XIV. further provides that an English officer will be appointed at Hongkong to examine the passes and registers of all Chinese vessels that may repair to that port to buy or sell goods; and in the case of irregularity to report to the Chinese authorities, and ‘by this arrangement, it was hoped that piracy and illegal traffic would be effectually prevented.’

A very admirable arrangement, and no doubt it might have been a great check both to piracy and illegal traffic, but one essential to its efficacy was wholly wanting; namely, some security that none but the proper and legitimate use should be made on the part of the mandarins of this controlling power; and that it should not, under pretext of a treaty right and the vigilant performance of a duty, be converted into an instrument of speculation and obstruction, first to enrich the officers and subordinates who had to deliver the pass: secondly, to prevent a trade perfectly legalized by treaty from taking any development, and thus subverting the whole spirit and object of the treaty, and rendering even the provisioning of Hongkong a matter of uncertainty and difficulty, since all the supplies have

to be drawn from the opposite coast. Yet this was the course systematically and undeviatingly pursued. Here, again, there was a conditional engagement; and the absolute refusal in practice on the Chinese side to perform their part in good faith made it simply suicidal, and therefore impracticable, for the British Government to keep the corresponding engagement.

We have now pretty nearly exhausted the list of grievances, real and supposed, which the Chinese can bring against us:—missionary labours in the interior and irregularities in trading;—assumed revolutionary propagandism;—the fostering and promoting trade in opium, a wholly prohibited article;—imperfections and inconsistencies in our colonial legislation, as it affects the *lorcha* and coasting trade;—and the rights of sovereignty in respect to Chinese subjects, criminals and others, to whom the colony serves as a secure refuge, withdrawing them from Chinese jurisdiction, to the prejudice and injury of their own country.

To what conclusions do these considerations lead, as a necessary and logical sequence,—if these facts and premises have, as we aver and believe, been neither partially selected nor unfairly stated? They are shortly these. There is among French proverbs, that repository of the wisdom and common-sense of nations, one which furnishes a perfect summary of all we have to say, '*Ne courez pas deux lièvres à la fois!*' If we would apply the maxim to Chinese affairs, then the moral would be no other than this:

Commerce and religious propagandism are in a great degree incompatible objects in China,—if you will not relinquish either, one must be kept subordinate to the other; but do not attempt anything so irrational as to pursue both at the same time, under conditions calculated only to be mutually destructive.

Trading in opium, while Chinese laws and public opinion in that country continue what they now are, is fatal to any improvement in our relations, political or commercial. It must be abandoned, therefore, or subordinated upon some rational principle in concert with the Chinese Government, if legitimate commerce is not to be sacrificed by the very means supposed to promote it.

The attempt to create and maintain a commercial and revenue-raising colony at Hongkong is incompatible with the legitimate trade for which we made the treaty. The maintenance of it as a harbour for refuge for a piratical and insurrectionary population, with no efficient means of preventing their carrying mischief up the coasts and to the mainland, is

incompatible with any friendly relations or improvement in our position. The register of lorchas, and other small vessels, conferring the right of our flag upon Chinese born subjects, can hardly be so guarded by legislative enactment, as to prevent the most serious abuses and real grievances to the Chinese Government. If, then, we wish in good earnest to improve our commercial relations with China, obtain enlarged markets, and greater facilities for prosecuting a legitimate trade, and to place these upon a more secure and permanent footing, sound policy and justice alike demand that we should apply ourselves to remove these grievances.

Having considered what are the obstacles to a better understanding than has hitherto prevailed, more especially in the south, and to the permanent improvement of our relations, both commercial and political, we rejoice that the more agreeable task now devolves upon us, of showing the grounds for hope in ultimate success. We have written in no spirit of mere partisanship. The questions of international morality are too grave, and the interests at stake altogether too large and important, for such partial discussion. It will be seen that if jealous of our good name and national honours, we have not the less freely commented on what we consider to be just grounds of complaint against foreign Powers and ourselves; more especially as regards the errors of our colonial policy in Hongkong. Nay, to some it may appear we have probed them with no tender or friendly hand; but if we have discussed these various points in all their bearings, and with earnestness, it has been from the conviction that they constituted the most serious obstacles to the improvement of our relations, and the extension of our commerce,—objects of primary importance. We have the further conviction that it is neither for our interest, nor fair to the Minister about to undertake the arduous task of placing those relations upon a better basis, either to conceal or to under-rate the real and perplexing nature of the difficulties he must be prepared to encounter. The appointment of Lord Elgin to the post of Plenipotentiary in China has had the rare fortune of being approved on every side. He proceeds thither with a well-earned reputation for ability, judgment, and tact, derived from his successful administration in Canada as Governor-general; and if his Lordship returns, as we trust he will, with a new success in China, it will be one of which he may be justly proud.

Notwithstanding the undoubted existence of many and serious obstacles, there are not wanting circumstances of excellent augury, full of encouragement. The savage judicial murder in the province of Canton of a French missionary, M. Chapdelaine,

so far back as February of last year, and the impossibility of obtaining any redress, has led the French Government to increase its naval force in China, in order to insist upon satisfaction; and orders have further been sent out for the most cordial co-operation of the squadron under Admiral Rigault de Genouilly with Admiral Seymour. Such assistance in any material sense is not needed; but so important do we deem it, that the three maritime Powers—England, France, and America, should be united in China, in reference to the future, that we hail with pleasure anything tending that way. The Americans have already been actively engaged on their own behalf, and where interests are so identical, it can hardly fail to lead to a similar identity of policy. The mail just received, on the other hand, gives some reason to believe that the Emperor of China still desires to see hostilities limited to Canton, and that on the arrival of the powerful armament which will support Lord Elgin, the Court of Peking may recognise the expediency of timely negotiation. Indeed, while Mr. Cobden and his supporters were predicting the most fatal consequences from the determined stand taken by our authorities in China, and lengthened hostilities with inextinguishable anger on the part of the Emperor and the whole population of China, as the only natural or probable result,—it is said that this potentate, for the first time since he mounted the throne, has given indication of a desire to maintain friendly relations, and to afford redress. We place but little confidence in this rumour of prompt submission, and we are not over-sanguine as to any immediate result; above all, it is important that the British Government should not show a moment's hesitation in the despatch of the effective force already destined for China. Lord Elgin's success will mainly depend on such evidence of the determination of his Government to meet the danger with which our interests have been menaced, in a manner commensurate with their importance, and not to stop until our relations with the Chinese Empire have been entirely re-established on a more satisfactory basis.

ART. X.—*Hansard's Parliamentary Debates for the Months of February and March, 1857.*

THE fourth Parliament of Queen Victoria has become a matter of history. It is gathered to its predecessors—the Parliaments of other days, and has left to us the turmoil of replacing it, and the anxiety which attends the opening of a fresh epoch in our Parliamentary history. The late House of Commons had not attained to a longevity beyond the average; yet those who consider the circumstances under which the Parliament of 1852 came into existence, will rather see reason to wonder that it lasted so long than that it endured no longer. The twin influences that presided over its birth were as little favourable to its continuance as to its credit or efficiency. Religious intolerance and economical absurdity united their last effort to infuse into a Parliament, elected under the auspices of Lord Derby, their baneful and anarchical tendencies. In 1852 the country had not recovered from the shock of the aggressive papal movement of two years before, and the utmost advantage was taken, by candidates of all persuasions, of the exasperated state of public feeling. It soon appeared, to the disgrace and scandal of free institutions, that a majority of the sixth Reformed Parliament had pledged itself to measures of bigotry which an unreformed Parliament would have repudiated. Nor did that House of Commons falsify the pledges under which it was elected. The cause of toleration and religious liberty can boast no triumph since 1852. Again and again has Mr. Spooner obtained the sanction of the House to a bill for the withdrawal of the Maynooth Grant, which has only been defeated by a not unnatural, nor perhaps unpardonable, abuse of the forms of the House. The admission of Jews into Parliament has been languidly supported by decreasing majorities. The jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts with all its abuses has survived the power which threatened to abolish it; and church-rates still continue to spread disunion and propagate dissent in spite of Sir William Clay's annual motion for their abolition.

The Parliament of 1852 was elected under the auspices of a Protectionist Ministry. Whatever be the theory of our representative system, the Government in power must exercise a very considerable influence over the choice of the nation. The question of Free Trade or Protection was one, which, from its very nature, as it was then most erroneously understood, secured for Lord Derby the representation of the counties. Men committed to a theory which science and experience had

pronounced absolutely untenable, were more likely to assist the Government with their votes than the House by their abilities. But this was not the worst part of that discreditable election; conscious that their cause was unpopular, and half convinced that it was absurd, the supporters of Lord Derby in the boroughs condescended to arts of suppression, evasion, and equivocation which gave little promise for their future parliamentary career; while, on the other hand, many persons, whose attachment to Liberal principles and opinions has been shown in the result to be exceedingly feeble, traded on the single profession of the doctrines of Free Trade, and thus obtained from the Liberal party a confidence which they have not failed signally to abuse. These results are always seen where one topic engrosses the public mind to the exclusion of every other: the Reform agitation gave birth to a race of politicians who most veraciously professed to be for the bill, and nothing but the bill; and the Free-trade conflict of 1852 introduced into the House of Commons many members whose sole connexion with the Liberal party was their adhesion, a few months before the Protectionists themselves, to the principles of unrestricted competition.

From all these causes it resulted that the late House of Commons contained many men of sterling honesty but of limited intelligence,—many ‘loose fish’ who, as a narrow view of their interest prompted, were ready to serve or overthrow the Government of the day—and many men, who, though neither deficient in honesty nor in ability, very imperfectly represented the sentiments of the constituencies by which they were returned.

To this class belonged in an especial degree two kinds of politicians, professing no positive allegiance to any great party in the State, unable to command that amount of parliamentary or of popular support which is required to conduct the affairs of the country, not deriving any large amount of sympathy or respect from their personal characters or their opinions, but exercising an unquestionable influence in the House of Commons by their eloquence and their use of the artifices of debate, in those critical emergencies which are the test of good judgment and good faith in public men. This ‘rolling ballast’ of the ship, as these sections were humorously and accurately called by a Radical Admiral, has invariably flung its weight to the lee-side, when the vessel was tossing and pitching in the heaviest seas, or when she was sailing close-hauled to the wind. The Manchester school, which acquired its importance by the successful agitation and ultimate repeal of the Corn Laws, and the select body of the followers and pupils of the

late Sir Robert Peel, have throughout the last Parliament caused their power to be felt for purposes the most injurious to the general and permanent interests of the nation and of Parliamentary Government itself. Throughout the war, which has been the principal concern of the people of England during this period, their arguments, their oratory, their organs have been employed to strengthen the misguided confidence of the enemy in what absolute courts regard as the inherent weakness of Representative Government—to disguise and misrepresent the magnanimous resolution of the country—and even to shake, as far as lay in their power, the confidence of our allies. In the structure of successive administrations, and the business of successive Sessions of Parliament, their influence has been equally mischievous and unpractical. If some of them have been prevailed upon to exchange the liberty of declamation for the responsibility of office, they sought and found an early opportunity of throwing up the duties they had assumed, at the time and in the manner most injurious to the public service. They weakened the authority of the Executive Government without strengthening the authority of Parliament; and they forfeited the power they were entitled by their abilities to obtain, because they failed to represent the convictions and the sentiments of any important class of their countrymen. To the existence and the tactics of these two sections of politicians—these nondescripts and hybrids, sprung from a state of things which they have survived—we mainly attribute what has been somewhat ambitiously termed, ‘the declining efficiency of Parliament.’ These stumbling-blocks to legislative progress, these examples of a relaxed state of party discipline, these real impediments to good and energetic Government, existed, not by the will of the Government which they thwarted, nor by the will of the people whom they did not represent; and it was an absurd injustice to impute to successive Ministers of the Crown, shortcomings caused by the deterioration and division of the House of Commons.

The result of this waste of the strength of the Liberal party and artificial increase of the numbers of Conservatives, has been what might have been predicted: the House of Commons has been fickle, pliable, and uncertain, ready to support each party by turns, and to abide by none—extending its ephemeral favour to every possible combination of parties—winding up with an ominous conjunction between Lord John Russell, Mr. Disraeli, and Mr. Gladstone—and terminating its captious existence by a sudden revolt and by a penal, but not an unmerited dissolution. Faithful and faithless alike to every shade of poli-

tical opinion, the late Parliament exhibited a vacillation and inconstancy, a waywardness and a petulance, which remind us of nothing so forcibly as the frailest members of that sex which is excluded from its deliberations. The best that can be said of it is that it has never shown itself disposed to resist, and has given many proofs of its readiness to follow, public opinion; the worst, that it has left on record very few sharply defined and clearly expressed opinions of its own.

Such was the state of affairs which rendered a dissolution of Parliament imperatively necessary. Nearly eighteen months ago we first urged in this Journal the importance of an early appeal to the country, if stability and vigour were to be imparted to Lord Palmerston's administration in our domestic as well as in our foreign relations,—foreseeing, even in the autumn of 1855, that the constitution of the House of Commons was not such as to afford to the Government the support on which its real efficiency depends. We regret, not that the dissolution has come at last, but that the opportunity to dissolve did not occur at an earlier period; though no doubt the interval which has since elapsed has demonstrated to the most incredulous, that the electoral constituencies of the United Kingdom are prepared to give Lord Palmerston a very different amount of support from that which he met with in the late House of Commons.

If we turn from the last Parliament in its collective capacity to its constituent parts, we shall find that a survey of those parts confirms the disparaging estimate which we have just taken of the whole body. It has been said, that of all parties the Conservatives are most responsible for whatever is defective in the working of the House of Commons; that if we had a better Opposition we should have a better Government, and if a better Government, a better disciplined and more efficient House of Commons. Nothing is easier than to bring such charges against the Opposition, but those who urge them scarcely seem to make sufficient allowance for the difficulties in which the so-called Conservative party finds itself. No doubt there was a time when the Conservatives possessed principles which they avowed as loudly and maintained as stoutly as the most devout worshipper of our Constitution under the form of party government could desire. But one by one, and year by year, they have been compelled to give up the profession of those opinions which bound them together;—the arbitrary power of the sovereign—the necessity of putting down the spread of liberal ideas by arms on the continent, and by state prosecutions in this country—intolerance, first to dissenters and then to Roman Catholics—the maintenance of a rotten

municipal and commercial system, have each in their turn been abandoned; and though it be as impossible to say when the Tories ceased to be Tory as to point out the exact time when the galley of Theseus lost its identity and became a mere aggregate of patches and repairs, there can be no doubt that with the Conservative party the period of transition is long since passed. The advocacy of a series of false principles bears with it this among other disadvantages, that when these principles are finally exploded they leave in the minds of their quondam votaries a vacuum which there is nothing to replace; words are substituted for ideas, and men, who once had a firm faith and honest conviction, are left at the mercy of every charlatan who can palm upon them vague generalities and high-sounding phrases as a substitute for the faith which they have lost. But experience shows that a party cannot be long held together by the best concocted phrases of the most dexterous political thaumaturge.

What then, we repeat, are the Conservatives to do, for it is evident that mere words and phrases will avail them no longer? The 'Quarterly Review' has its counsel ready: You were a party, it says, before the Free-trade controversy arose, and you may be after it is settled: fall back upon your ancient principles; forget the unhappy episode of Protection; take to your bosom again those leaders and allies whom that unfortunate aberration has alienated, and rally once more in defence of the altar, the throne, and the constitution. Admirable advice if our Tory contemporary would condescend to tell us the nature of the danger against which a rally is necessary, or any distinctive principle of the Tory party in times past which it could venture to avow at the present time without incurring the unanimous condemnation of the country. Before the anti-free-trade stand was anti-reform, and before anti-reform anti-toleration. Will Boroughmongering do more than Protection, or is Intolerance a better shibboleth than Boroughmongering? We believe not; and therefore, evil as the plight of the Tory party is, we see no plausible suggestion for its amendment. Indeed, the language of the Tory journals is sufficiently significant of the distracted condition of their party, and the exhausted resources of their leaders. The burden of their complaint is, not that too much reform is attempted, but that too little is perfected; and writers or statesmen, who in past times have resisted the work of improvement at every stage, now pass in review the memorable achievements of former Liberal Governments, with an air of reproachful triumph, as if the success of every one of these measures were not the bitterest censure on

the short-sighted and intemperate opposition they had once to encounter.

The Liberal party have suffered, though not to the same extent, from the same causes which have disorganised, and threaten ultimately to demolish, their old antagonists. They have suffered in a mere party point of view, by the now undisputed triumph of their own principles. The avowal of the doctrines of civil and religious liberty, of reform, retrenchment, and free trade costs at the present time so little,—and after the series of victories of the last thirty years means so little,—that we cannot wonder to find it often made with little sincerity, and acted on with little consistency. In the struggle between public interest and local abuses, it is not uncommon to see men ranking by profession amongst the most advanced Liberals advocating the most flagrant usurpations, with a spirit worthy of the days of Perceval or Castlereagh. Nor is there as much zeal as might be wished, in applying principles already established to new cases: men will concede the freedom of trade, while in the same breath they deny the liberty of association; will reform one corporate abuse, and defend another exactly similar; will advocate the amendment of the law, and pertinaciously assert the vested rights of proctors, attorneys, and Ecclesiastical Courts, to the continuance of its very worst abuses. Liberal principles are now uncontested, and because uncontested are less remembered and less applied by their professors than they used to be. Liberalism is the dominant creed, and like, the Established Church, is sure to have, in addition to its true votaries, the lukewarm, the time-serving and the indifferent among its professors. From the security which attends success has come a relaxation of party discipline, which has forced Government to put upon those mystic words, the confidence of the House of Commons, a much looser construction than formerly. Men treat Parliament more as a debating club, and less as a deliberative assembly. They are apt to look at every question upon its abstract merits, without sufficiently reflecting that a vote of the House of Commons is something more than a mere affirmative or negative proposition; that it is a practical step, which ought to be based upon practical considerations, and must be followed by immediate practical results.

But not only has the Liberal party been weakened by the general recognition of its own principles, it has also suffered by the successful results of them. Material goodwill and content, the fruit of mild and popular government, and great material prosperity, the consequence of free trade, have half superseded the vocation of the reformer, and rendered the mass of mankind more

anxious to retain the good things they possess, than to risk them in the pursuit of violent and untried changes. The desire for great organic changes, and the bold application of abstract principles to existing institutions, sprang from a sense of suffering and injustice, in the great mass of people, rife enough thirty years ago, but in the happier times in which we live almost entirely wanting. The old party watchwords are repeated, the old party pledges are exacted, but the fuel which fed the flame of discontent is gone, and with it the craving for mighty inroads on the constitution.

Thus the Liberal and Tory party alike—the one by its uniform success, the other by its uniform failure—have experienced, though by no means in equal degrees, a decline of efficiency and a relaxation of discipline. We say by no means in an equal degree; for though the Tory party has no distinct doctrine to defend, and might, so far as political assets are concerned, very properly follow its two principal organs of the daily press into the Insolvent Court, the Liberal party has, if be it so minded, a glorious and a boundless future before it. The principle of resistance is sterile and sure to be undermined by time; the doctrines of progress are eminently fruitful, and not a day passes over our heads without adding something to their development and expansion. Work may fail the party agitator, but worthy objects of new labour and enlarged contemplation can never be wanting to the really liberal and progressive statesman.

We have pointed out the decline of mere party influences as a fact resulting necessarily from the course of events and the present state of English society; but this view of the subject would be incomplete without adverting to another concurrent cause,—the vastly increased influence of public opinion upon Parliamentary parties and their leaders. The circle within which mere party differences are allowable or possible is greatly contracted by the enlarged political judgment of the nation, and the licence of misrepresentation wonderfully abridged by the diffusion of correct information. No sooner is a question distinctly raised in Parliament, than it is thoroughly ventilated and discussed by the press; opinion is formed, and against that opinion no party leader in the House of Commons is bold enough to make a resolute stand. We leave it to others to lament over the decline of party; for ourselves we prefer to consider it as an inevitable result of the progress of knowledge, the influence of the press, and the rapid and correct publication of those speeches, upon which the opinion of the legislature is formed. If the increasing intelligence of the public has weakened the influence of party, it is bound to supply the defect which

it has caused, by a new corrective influence of its own. The intelligence of the House should rise with the intelligence of the constituent body, and the chance of collision between the country and its representatives be met by the choice of men superior to the arts of faction and the tricks of rhetoric.

We have next to consider the circumstances which have led, as it now appears step by step, to the present dissolution of Parliament, and which must be fully understood to appreciate the nature and requirements of the present crisis. The government of Lord Aberdeen contained three men, whose destinies since its disruption in January 1855, have been widely different, though at intervals intertwined with each other. These men are Lord John Russell, Mr. Gladstone, and Lord Palmerston. Impatient of the second place in Lord Aberdeen's government, foiled in his plan of reform, and discontented with his position, his party, and himself, Lord John Russell was in no mood to bear patiently the storm of popular indignation, produced by the first accounts of the sufferings of the army in the Crimea, which took place under, if they were not produced by, the administration of the war department by two of his Peelite colleagues. Under the influence of an unhappy delusion, which has led him of late years to suppose that no liberal Government can be formed without his headship; and that the elements of any Government which he may think fit to destroy will immediately unite around himself, Lord John Russell, in an evil hour for his own reputation, joined the assailants of the Ministry to which he belonged, and powerfully assisted in dissolving it. Entirely deceived in his expectations, he accepted office under Lord Palmerston, who showed himself in this, as in many other instances, more mindful of ancient services than of recent injuries. Lord John Russell was subsequently driven from office by no act of Lord Palmerston or his Government, but simply because he was convicted, out of his own mouth, of an attempt to make Parliament believe that his view of the terms on which peace might be made with Russia, was totally different from that recently assented to by him at Vienna. Even in this extremity, Lord Palmerston did not desert him, and it was in deference to the strongly expressed opinion of his own adherents in the House and of the country, and not from desertion by his colleagues, that Lord John Russell, after having overthrown one set of colleagues in January, was driven to secede from another administration in June. In the ill-starred Education measure of last year, Lord John had the support of the Government, — a support rendered rather from the feeling of personal respect to a statesman

fallen on evil days, than from any conviction of its practicability. In fact, it is not ~~too much to say~~, that up to the present moment, Lord John Russell has not had the semblance of a just ground of complaint against the present Government.

These facts, which are public and indisputable, had undoubtedly alienated from Lord John Russell many of his former supporters, and raised grave doubts whether he would retain his seat for the City of London. By dint of great personal exertions, by one of those energetic appeals to past services which are never preferred in vain to the people of this country, and by the assistance of the Hebrew community, this election was carried, and Lord John Russell was placed next to Baron Rothschild on the poll. It may deserve to be remembered, that in the course of these proceedings, although Lord John appeared in some degree in the character of an opponent of the Government, he formally recognised the claim of Lord Palmerston to remain at the head of affairs, and he affected to disclaim all intention to supplant his former colleague. A sentiment which, if persisted in, does him the highest honour.

Turn we now to the career of Mr. Gladstone. This able and eloquent man seems now to have attained the zenith of his oratorical powers, and to have developed all the faculties and tendencies of his extraordinary mind; so that the time has arrived, when we may endeavour, with such fairness as is granted to contemporaries, to estimate his career, his character, and his future. It was his fortune to be a distinguished student at Oxford, at the time when the Tractarian party was in course of formation, and from that circumstance the influences which have lent a colour to his personal opinions and to his political conduct are probably derived. Endowed with an intellect extremely subtle and casuistical, ever seeking to found itself rather on an abstract than a practical basis, he was allured by the brilliant but flimsy abstractions which invested the Christian Church with the nature of a Platonic idea. From these principles he has, with infinite skill and perseverance, deduced with equal facility every species of conclusion as it was wanted; first elevating the Church of England—then tending at least in the direction of the Church of Rome—calculating the odds in favour of the Apostolical succession at, we believe, 8000 to 1—and appealing to a state conscience, which was something different from the conscience of any one of its citizens, and from that of all its citizens put together. From these soaring reveries he was, happily for his own reputation, roused by the advent to power of Sir Robert Peel, whose sagacity discerned in him a very

fit instrument for the preparation of his financial schemes. Even under the influence of that great statesman, Mr. Gladstone displayed the sensitive inconsistency of his character, by quitting the Cabinet which was about to place Maynooth on a permanent footing, though he has ever since given to that very measure his best support. At what time Mr. Gladstone discarded the doctrines of Protection we are not informed, though there is no doubt that the acuteness of his intellectual powers did not save him from becoming the victim of fallacies, of the exposure of which he seems to think he has inherited the monopoly. As the Chancellor of the Exchequer of Lord Aberdeen's Government, Mr. Gladstone introduced further improvements in our tariff, and succeeded in the very arduous task of imposing a succession-duty; but he detracted from the merit of these great exploits, by the introduction into finance of refinements and subtleties peculiarly his own, which have tended to involve the whole subject in not a little confusion and disorder. To him we owe mainly the invention of prospective budgets, the doctrine of compacts between the Exchequer and the nation, and the unfortunate attempt to create a two-and-a-half per cent. stock, together with the still more unfortunate compulsory conversion of the South Sea and other minor stocks. Mr. Gladstone luxuriates in the metaphysics of finance; he is never more eloquent and impressive than when dealing with figures; his additions are performed in a species of oratorical ecstasy, and his subtractions are made with the violence of a paroxysm. By casting the horoscope of the country for seven years from 1853, Mr. Gladstone was able to persuade himself and the House of Commons, on the faith of a number of anticipations, not one of which has yet been realised, that it would be in their power, in 1860, to remove the income-tax altogether, although he was far from pledging the Government to such a step. By a similar gift of prophecy, he divined that the funds, which were then at 102, would continue at that remarkable point of elevation long enough to float his two and a half per cent. stock, an expectation that was just as signally falsified, as that of the income and expenditure of the next four years. Notwithstanding the brilliancy of Mr. Gladstone's oratorical powers, attentive observers already traced in these things, symptoms of that singular want of common sense, and that incurable unsoundness of judgment, which recent events have so signally illustrated. 'Utinam,' it was said of him, in the words of the Roman orator, a great judge of the value of fine speaking, 'Utinam in eo talis mens ad rempublicam benegerendam fuisset, quale ingenium ad bene dicendum fuit.'

Confidence in him was not at that time overthrown, but it was shaken; and the first indication was already given that this man, so brilliant as an orator, so ingenious as a financier, partly from the super-subtlety of his dialectics, partly from the irritability of his temper, and partly from an incurable infirmity of judgment, might be capable of persuading, astonishing, or even convincing, but was neither safe in counsel nor straightforward in action.

Mr. Gladstone and his friends separated from Lord Palmerston on the question of the Crimean inquiry, and from the very moment of separation betook themselves to thwart, by every means in their power, the policy of the war for which they were jointly responsible. The country has not forgotten, and is not likely soon to forget, their tone on the Vienna Conferences, on the Turkish loan, and on similar occasions when Russia was magnified, England depreciated, the alliance with France endangered, and every art of sophistry and misrepresentation used to persuade the country that Russia, while conceding nothing, had granted everything, and that the heaviest blood-guiltiness rested on the heads of those who prolonged the contest after the Conferences of Vienna.

The commencement of the past Session found Lord Palmerston covered with the glory of having trodden the wine-press alone. He had just baffled, by an admirable mixture of firmness and dexterity, the attempt of Russia to evade that portion of the Treaty of Peace which shut her out of the waters of the Danube, and he had been driven into hostilities with Persia by a flagrant breach of faith on the part of that feeble Government. Throughout the country an agitation prevailed for the abatement of the war income tax, from sixteen-pence to seven-pence in the pound. No sooner had the House met than a new and parti-coloured Opposition took the field: Mr. Gladstone, Sir James Graham, Mr. Herbert, Lord John Russell, and Mr. Disraeli, all gave symptoms of acting for a common object, if not under the influence of common concert and deliberation. The war cloud under which they had cowered had drifted by, and they raised their heads, like Milton's fallen angels, from the oblivious pool, to plot anew for the recovery of all that the last two years had cost them. The active part of the Session barely lasted a month, and never, we apprehend, was so much faction crowded into so small a space of time. In their eagerness to destroy a Government which they had successively deserted, and against which not one of them had any personal ground for offence, these incongruous allies completely forgot that there was a watchful public out of doors; and because their own voices

sounded much within the walls of Parliament, they fell into the not uncommon error of believing that the country looked with apathy or approval on their proceedings. They were signally mistaken, and they have just been fatally undeceived.

The first note was sounded by Mr. Gladstone: he raised the cry of further retrenchment; spoke of the necessity of doing battle with the estimates before the House entered on the Ways and Means, and so soon as he saw that Government acceded to this proposition, exerted himself to prevent the House from going into the very Committee of Supply which he had desired. He greedily caught, on the first night of the Session, at the ridiculous statement made by Mr. Disraeli of the existence of a secret treaty between France and Austria, —a treaty for which, had it really existed, and been really entered into by the advice of the English Government, he was just as much responsible as Lord Palmerston himself. His manner and deportment showed great mental excitement, and it required no very profound knowledge of political meteorology to predict a violent explosion. On the discussion of Sir George Lewis's Budget that explosion took place. Emotions long pent up found vent in words, and the House of Commons witnessed a scene, such as in the quiet times in which we live is extremely unusual. The Budget of the Chancellor of the Exchequer was simplicity itself: to say the truth, Sir G. C. Lewis had very little choice in the matter. * The country insisted on striking the war nine-pence off the income-tax; the war expenditure still continued to some extent; and in order to meet the deficiency, the taxes on tea and sugar were unavoidably arrested in their fall. On this subject Mr. Gladstone delivered a speech, which for intemperance of language, unfairness of statement and construction, and absolute and complete mystification of the subject, he will find it difficult, and any one else impossible, to equal. To suspend the fall in the duties on tea and sugar he denounced as a cheat, palming off an increase of taxation as a diminution. He was at great pains to prove that the expenditure could not be materially reduced, he denounced any attempt to increase indirect taxation, and stigmatised the temporary duties upon tea and sugar as a complete reversal of the whole financial policy of Sir Robert Peel. He then turned to direct taxation, and declared that to continue the income-tax at its present rate of seven-pence, was a breach of the solemn compact of 1853; although when pressed to explain the alternative he would himself have adopted, it was obvious that he would have attempted to keep on the war nine-pence altogether; and he went so far as to declare that, had he done what the pre-

sent Chancellor of the Exchequer *has* done, he should have been a charlatan and a swindler. We say nothing of the amenities of debate, nothing of the respect and consideration due to such a man as the present Chancellor of the Exchequer, from a person every way his inferior except in mere volubility of tongue, but we may pause for a moment to consider the logical position in which Mr. Gladstone involved himself. 'We cannot remain as we are,' he says; 'the financial position is intolerable, a deficiency stares us in the face. We cannot diminish the expenditure, we must not increase the taxes;' what then are we to do? we can neither remain as we are, nor change our position. The country is reduced to an absurdity — summarily ejected from the laws of time and space, and all the other conditions of existence. What is that which cannot remain as it is, nor become different; which is incapable of stability or change; whose disorders are at once remediable and incurable; whose state is at once endurable and intolerable? Nothing that we know of satisfies these conditions, except the financial state of England as described by Mr. Gladstone. He pronounces and demonstrates, after his own fashion, the disorder to be incurable, and then rails bitterly against the rival physician for not effecting a cure, and is perfectly willing to undertake the management of the disorder himself.

We hope this distressing exhibition will be a warning against the dangers of prospective finance, and the folly of making compacts about such matters as income and expenditure. Mr. Gladstone proved in 1853, to his own satisfaction at least, that we should be in a condition to take off the income-tax in 1860; but inexorable time, which does not understand logic, and has little respect for hypothesis, has made wild work with the data of the calculation. Mr. Gladstone estimated the succession tax at 2,000,000*l.*, it has now reached 500,000*l.*; he took credit for licenses on trade to the amount of 13,000*l.* which licenses he was forced to abandon; he anticipated 640,000*l.* as the result of the operations of the sinking fund in diminishing the charge at 80,000*l.* a year for eight years, but there has been no surplus on which the sinking fund could act; on the contrary, we are saddled with 1,250,000*l.* additional charge for the expenses of the war, and we are called upon to pay off exchequer bonds at the rate of 2,000,000*l.* a year for three years, besides 1,000,000*l.* per annum for sixteen years, to pay off the first loan of 16,000,000*l.* All these things, Mr. Gladstone says, make no difference. He engaged to take off the income-tax in 1860, and sketched a scale for its gradual reduction, and for the decline in the duties on tea and sugar. To that precise scale we

must adhere, though every calculation on which it was made has been falsified, though every expectation on which it was based was disappointed.

Such are the delusive fruits of prospective finance. Taxes are obtained from Parliament on the faith of representations which are never realised, partly because they are founded on false data, partly because they rest on contingencies which no human sagacity can foresee; but of all the effects of the introduction of this hypothetical element into finance, none is so fatal as to import into such transactions the utterly inapplicable notion of a compact. A compact must have two parties, but in this case there is but one, — the nation, which is the single principal acting through different sets of public agents. A compact carries with it the notion of conflicting interests, but how can the nation as represented by the Chancellor of the Exchequer or the House of Commons have one interest, and the nation in its collective capacity have another? A compact implies good faith, but how can a nation be bound to itself to do that which is not for its own interest? If the obligation be forfeited, who is the injured party? who is to sue upon the bond? Mr. Gladstone speaks as if every tax were a gain to the Government and a loss to the nation; a principle which, if true, would overthrow every Government, since Government is only tolerable on the supposition that its interests are identical with those of the governed. We trust that this unsound and dangerous casuistry will disappear with Mr. Gladstone, and that future Chancellors of the Exchequer will be content to proceed on our ancient plan, which has, at any rate, the merit of being simple and intelligible, — of avoiding altogether the imputation of obtaining money under false pretences, — of limiting the responsibility of the Minister to the year over which his operations extend, — and of relieving him from the duty of fighting for crotchets and chimeras against the demand which unforeseen circumstances have created.

After the debate on the Budget came Mr. Cobden's Chinese discussion, which brought out, in the clearest and most unequivocal light, the feelings entertained towards the present Government, and the desire of all the leaders of the Liberal party not included within it, to possess themselves at once of what are called in America the spoils of office. It is a curious fact that, with the single exception of the Right. Hon. Edward Ellice, every member of Parliament who had held office in a former cabinet voted in that division against a Liberal Government supported by nine-tenths of the Liberal party; not for

anything it had done, but for not immediately censuring and disavowing, in the face of an insolent enemy, actions considered by every one on the spot to be right, and executed by a naval commander whom everybody admitted to be at once humane, judicious, and brave. Such an extension of the doctrine of constructive responsibility might, perhaps, be expected from the rage of a disappointed and unscrupulous Opposition; but for men expressing the same principles, who had sat in the same cabinet, and fought for years the same parliamentary battles, it is, even in our own parliamentary history, rich as it is in tales of treachery and tergiversation, happily without a parallel. These statesmen, who had participated in the cares of office, and had some of them contributed to frame the very treaties which had been grossly violated, were all equally ready to

‘ Explain their country’s dear-bought rights away,
And plead for pirates in the face of day.’

Take the case of Lord John Russell. He felt himself bound, no doubt from conscientious motives, to differ from the Ministry on a point so vital that an adverse decision must be fatal either to the Government or the Parliament; but might he not have remembered that this Ministry consisted of old friends and colleagues, who had faithfully and loyally stood by him under the storm of unpopularity which ultimately drove him from power? Might he not, without deviating from the stoical firmness of his attitude and the patriotic resolution to be just and fear not, have condescended to inform some at least of his most confidential friends that he felt bound to attack them, and have suggested the terms on which he should feel justified in giving them his support? It is painful to write such things of Lord John Russell, but what has been his life for the last seven years, except a repetition of the self-same mistake of wilful and contemptuous isolation? Without consulting anyone, he wrote his letter to the Bishop of Durham; and contributed to plunge the country into a barren anti-papal agitation, from the effects of which we have not yet fully recovered. Without consulting anyone, he announced his resignation in 1852; and thus not only exposed the country to ten months of Derby government, but caused the election of a Parliament under the twin influences of fanaticism and monopoly. Without consulting any one, he abandoned and broke up the Government of Lord Aberdeen as soon as a vote of censure was threatened; and thus inflicted on the nation the evils inseparable from a change of administration at the most critical period of the war. Without consulting his colleagues, he countenanced and approved, as far

as he could, the propositions of Russia at Vienna; and at last, without consulting anyone, he, who had already overthrown by his own act two Liberal administrations, joined, without a word of warning to his former friends, with Manchester and with Derby to effect the destruction of a third.

Of Mr. Disraeli and Mr. Cobden we need say nothing: each was labouring in his vocation; the one, to bring his own party into power, the other, to render all government impossible. But what are we to think of Mr. Gladstone? In his case there can be no doubt as to the *animus*. Every look, every gesture, every word since Parliament met, shows it only too plainly. By whatever means, at whatever cost to the public interests, to his own character, to the dignity and efficiency of Parliament, to the permanence of our Constitution itself, he is determined to return to power—with what allies or on what principles he seems to care very little. His triumph in the House of Commons was complete; but, as we have before pointed out, such triumphs are of little avail in the times in which we live, unless the press and the country sympathise with the victor. Those who are out of hearing of the modulation of his voice or the torrent of his declamation form a calmer, and, as it seems in this instance, a truer judgment of the cause and of the man: the cause they pronounce factious and vexatious; of the man they have formed a judgment equally decided, but not to be expressed in so few words. In spite of his eloquence, unsurpassed in our day, perhaps in our century, in spite of his abilities and experience, they regard him as one most dangerous to that side to which he belongs, and would hear with satisfaction a confirmation of the impression so generally prevalent that he has openly as well as virtually joined the ranks of Lord Derby's supporters. Like the elephant given by some eastern prince to the man he intends to ruin, Mr. Gladstone is an inmate too costly for any party to afford to keep long. The first cost is enormous, for to whichever side he attaches himself he must be paid for in a heavy reduction from the votes which can be mustered on a division. We cannot predict the future career of this extraordinary personage, but at present the repulsion which he exerts is so much more powerful than the attraction, that everything tends to the belief, that after oscillating from side to side the pendulum will ultimately rest in a position of perfect isolation, — an isolation even from those followers of Sir Robert Peel who, unfortunately for their own reputation and in opposition to their really Liberal tendencies, have hitherto followed the wayward guidance of Mr. Gladstone.

Much has been said and written on the great question whether this celebrated division can properly be denominated a coalition. The matter is one mainly of verbal criticism, for of the fact there is no doubt. After a debate of four nights, it can hardly be contended that any one within the House was ignorant either of the probable result of the division or of the forces by the union of which that result was to be obtained. If there was common action and common knowledge of that common action and the same end in view, there was to ordinary apprehension a coalition; and not the less so because the contract was implied, instead of being expressed in words. To suppose that each member voted without reference to the vote of his neighbour, would involve the absurdity so admirably described in the Rejected Addresses.

‘I sing how casual bricks, in airy climb,
Encounter’d casual cow-hair, casual lime;
How rafters, borne through wondering clouds elate,
Kissed in their slopt blue elemental slate,
Clasp’d solid beams in chance-directed fury,
And gave to birth our renovated Drury.’

But whilst these debates, these contests, and the unnatural agreement of the most uncongenial elements, wasted the strength of those who engaged in them, and recoiled with fatal effect on their impetuous authors, Lord Palmerston rose in the estimation of the country in exact proportion to the vehemence and the injustice which were banded against him. The events of the last five years, which have been so calamitous to many reputations for statesmanship and patriotism, serve only to shed a brighter lustre on the latest period of his career. We certainly belong to those members of the Liberal party who thought many of the acts of Lord Palmerston’s administration of the Foreign Office questionable, during the period in which he held the seals of that department under the authority and with the unqualified approval of Lord John Russell; and his memorable defence of that policy in 1850, followed as it was by a vote of indemnity or exculpation, was in our judgment not uncalled for. But we regard with far higher admiration and respect that period of the noble Lord’s public life which has elapsed since the defeat of Lord Derby’s shortlived Cabinet in 1852. It began by an act of disinterested and unselfish adhesion to the Ministry of Lord Aberdeen, although Lord Aberdeen had been one of the most constant opponents of the Foreign Policy of Lord Palmerston. He accepted the office of Secretary of State for the Home Department; and although the duties of that post were not the most congenial to his tastes and pursuits, no sign

of selfish discontent or petty restlessness ever proceeded from Lord Palmerston: he gave the Ministry which he had joined his best counsel and his best support; and he neither evaded his share of responsibility for its actions nor precipitated its fall. That administration was dissolved by the fault of others, not by his own. But those who had been most eager for its destruction were least able to form another Cabinet in its place, and after two abortive negotiations in other quarters, Lord Palmerston assumed the perilous task. That task was rendered more perilous, a few days after he assumed it, by the secession of men whose oratorical powers had given them influence in the House of Commons, but whose courage and resolution were not equal to the emergency. Under these circumstances Lord Palmerston began to rule:—the war was to be carried on upon a scale of almost unexampled magnitude—alliances were to be secured and maintained in different degrees of intimacy with all the States of Continental Europe, except the great empire to which we were opposed in arms—mistakes and shortcomings of every kind were to be corrected and supplied,—propositions and negotiations for peace were to be considered and carried on, without losing sight of those objects which the eventual success of the war has placed within our grasp. How ably the work has been performed may be inferred from the result, which enabled Lord Palmerston, within a year of taking office, to give his assent to terms of peace which satisfied Europe. And here we must pause to say, that whilst Lord Palmerston, as First Minister of the Crown, had undoubtedly the glory of setting his name to these great acts of policy, it was on Lord Clarendon that the most laborious and essential part of the conduct of these negotiations, both in London and Paris, necessarily devolved. Lord Clarendon, alone of the principal Members of the Cabinet, had retained the seals of his department from the time he received them, throughout all the vicissitudes which have affected the Government. Every other office has undergone changes more or less frequent: the Foreign Department has fortunately remained in the hands of the statesman who is by common consent best qualified to direct it, looking solely to the public good and without reference to party combinations or personal cabals.

Meanwhile the Parliamentary duties of the Ministry were discharged almost exclusively in the House of Commons by Lord Palmerston—and that in presence of no small array of vehement opponents and embarrassing allies. By his consummate skill in debate, his light touch, his fine temper, his disposition to ridicule rather than to invective, his steadfast adherence to his friends, his generous forbearance to his adversaries, and his

incomparable manners and address, he has surmounted difficulties which might have overpowered men of greater pretensions to legislative ingenuity or to oratorical power. These personal qualities, enhanced by his earnest and spirited adherence to the national cause, have endeared him to the sympathies of the nation. The elections have given back no uncertain response to his appeal; and since the Parliament which laid the foundation of the great administration of Mr. Pitt, England has not seen a House of Commons elected with so strong and all-pervading a confidence in the name and the fortunes of any single Minister.

But we are told by some of the malcontents of the Liberal party, that this confidence is excessive, if not misplaced—that there are many Reformers in our ranks of more tried sincerity and more ample promise than Lord Palmerston—that he is not identified with any of the questions of Education, Law Reform, Political Reform, or Administrative Reform which the new House of Commons will have to consider and to determine—and that his leadership will be fiercely disputed by those who ought to be his firmest supporters.

To this we reply that Lord Palmerston has shown throughout his long and varied career a ready perception of the real wants of the country. In our present condition there are few changes so urgent, few grievances so intolerable, that the work of reform and redress is to be pursued in season and out of season, and without reference to the spirit and events of the time. Nor do such changes rest on abstract principles of high political obligation, so much as upon the maturity of any given question in the public mind, and the conviction that the time for carrying it has arrived. A Minister in England has neither the power of forcing reforms upon Parliament for which the country is not prepared, nor that of resisting changes upon which the deliberate will of the enlightened majority of the nation is fixed. Legislative measures in this country are for the most part hardy plants: they are sown out of doors; they are transplanted into Parliament; they are at last adopted by the Cabinet. A Minister who should stake his reputation on rearing products of exotic growth or the meagre seedlings of coterie legislation would signally fail in the attempt.

It is, then, mainly to Parliament itself, and to the country through the Parliament, that we must look for the accomplishment of just, wise, and necessary progress in the work of Reform: and for this reason we view with the strongest interest, and with high satisfaction, the results of the late elections. The country has loudly protested against the abuse of Parliamentary

power, displayed in the votes which preceded the dissolution. So far the voice of the country is on the side of Executive Authority, and it is not unwilling that the hands of the Minister should be strengthened. But having liberally bestowed this support, having punished the disaffected, and reinforced the adherents of Lord Palmerston, the constituencies of England will watch with increased vigilance and anxiety the use which may be made of these ample powers.

On many accounts the returns of the elections which have just been made, afford one of the most valuable political lessons which are to be met with in the Parliamentary history of England. We pointed out, in the earlier pages of this article, the signal injury which two unattached sections of politicians—the followers of Mr. Cobden, and the followers of Mr. Gladstone—had done to their country, and to the House of Commons. It remains to be shown what punishment they have brought down upon themselves. If the borough elections mean anything, they mean that the electors of England repudiate the anti-national and discreditable sentiments which have been expressed by men arrogating to themselves, in a peculiar manner, the right to speak in the name of the people. Nor have these things been done in a corner. The defeat of Mr. Bright and Mr. Milner Gibson at Manchester, by majorities of 2000 votes,—the defeat of Sir Elkanah Armitage at Salford by the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department,—the defeat of Mr. Cobden at Huddersfield, a manufacturing town of his own selection, to which he had retreated from the nobler and broader field of the West Riding,—the defeat of men like Sir Joshua Walmisley at Leicester, Mr. John George Philimore at Leominster, Mr. Layard at Aylesbury, Mr. Otway at Stafford, Mr. W. J. Fox at Oldham, Mr. Miall at Rochdale, and several others of equal note in the extreme section of the Liberal Party, prove that their constituents have disapproved their inconstancy, their short-sightedness, their narrow and sometimes factious views on great questions of national policy. We do not conceive that this penalty has been inflicted on them solely, or even chiefly, on account of their recent vote on the quarrel with China. That vote was perfectly consistent with the course they pursued during the Russian War, in our late differences with the United States, and on every occasion when our national interests have been threatened by any foreign Power. In Manchester itself, the authority of the sect calling itself the Manchester School had come to be regarded as an intolerable oppression; and, although we have no doubt that several of the men we have named will, ere long,

find their way back to Parliament, and will render fresh services to the Liberal cause, they will probably not be entirely indifferent to the lesson which this election has taught them.

This total rout and dissolution of the Manchester party by their own constituencies, this disavowal of popular leaders by the people, has created some surprise even in this country; and among foreign spectators of our Parliamentary contests, it has been hailed with astonishment. The members of the late Parliament, who have been the victims of this ostracism, had contrived to obtain a good deal of fictitious importance or notoriety, not by promoting the great objects of Liberal Government, but by separating themselves from the genuine adherents of a Liberal Administration. The test of the election has demonstrated that their clamour had no echo in the country, and that the political good sense of the nation was far ahead of their own sagacity.

Mr. Gladstone and his friends have also suffered, and, in proportion to their numbers, not less severely. On Mr. Cobden's motion of censure on the Chinese question, about thirty-eight of the ordinary adherents of the present Ministry voted against the Government: of this number, twenty have not been re-elected. Among them must be reckoned Mr. Cardwell, Mr. Roundell Palmer, Sir J. W. Hogg, Dr. Phillimore, Sir Stafford Northcote, Colonel A. Gordon, and Mr. Granville Vernon,—some of them men of high Parliamentary qualifications, but who have unhappily embarrassed their own career by over-refinement and want of judgment. Among the younger generation of English statesmen, we know of no greater loss to the House of Commons than Mr. Cardwell, and we trust that he may ere long resume the position he ought to fill among liberal politicians. Nor does the English bar boast a greater ornament at this time than Mr. Roundell Palmer, who must at no distant period rise to the higher offices of his profession. As for the remaining number of this unfortunate crew, they have only escaped shipwreck, because none of them happen to represent large popular constituencies; indeed none of them could be returned for any large popular constituency, in their present anomalous position. They owe their political importance exclusively to their personal abilities, not to the trust reposed in them by any class of their countrymen. But if they were isolated and powerless in the last Parliament, except when they thought fit to follow Mr. Cobden or Mr. Disraeli into the lobby, what recruits will Mr. Gladstone claim on the 30th of April? What acceptance have his impassioned harangues and his overwrought arguments met with at the hands of the people of

England? He has accused the Ministers whom he still termed in the last Parliament 'his 'right honourable friends,' of every crime from falsehood to murder; and in the fervid peroration of his last speech he seemed to consider a vote, or, as he styled it, 'a decree,' of the House of Commons, as the highest expression of truth and justice upon earth. Within one little month the appeal of the Government from that House to the nation had been heard: the vote of the late House of Commons repudiated; most of the deserters who took part in that majority deprived of their legislative power; and Mr. Gladstone himself condemned to stand before the country in the character either of a false accuser or a visionary casuist.

It must in fairness be stated, that four of the subordinate members of the Government,—Admiral Berkeley, Mr. Frederick Peel, Lord Monck, and Mr. John Ball—have lost their seats. But this accident is attributable to local or personal causes, not to systematic opposition—indeed in three instances they have been superseded by other Ministerial candidates. We see especial reason to regret the temporary exclusion from Parliament (if no other seat be found for him) of the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies. Mr. John Ball is a rare example of an Irishman without faction, and a Roman Catholic without bigotry. He has forfeited his seat from a fixed determination not to owe it to corruption, or to the dictation of the priests; and Ireland loses one of her ablest and most honest representatives. Some further losses are apprehended in Ireland from the scandalous activity of the Roman Catholic priesthood, and from the unnatural combination they have in several instances formed.

In the English counties the result of the elections has been not less favourable to the Government than in the boroughs: the advantage gained is more striking and more unexpected; and the issue has been taken on different grounds. The struggle in the counties lay, not between Liberals and Pseudo-Liberals of different shades, but between the Liberals, who, for the first time since the organisation of the Conservative Party by Sir Robert Peel, have begun to resume their proper country influence, and the Tories in the old stronghold of their party. Although in many counties both of England and Scotland the registration had been culpably neglected, from the discouragement which was the result of previous contests, yet the Government candidates have obtained an amount of success which gives us great reason to regret that more county constituencies have not been canvassed and brought to the poll by Ministerial candidates. In many instances seats have been lost, or have not

been gained, more from the absence of eligible Liberal candidates, than from any other cause. Nevertheless we have seen three Ministerial candidates returned for the county of Norfolk, and unwonted victories won by the Liberal party in South Essex, North Lincolnshire, Huntingdon, South Warwickshire, North Nottingham, Berkshire, and other purely agricultural districts. Dorset places a Whig member at the head of the poll, and in South Northamptonshire the honoured name of Althorp reappears in support of the principles identified with it. The Liberal gain in the English counties alone is not far short of twenty votes. To these must be added the returns of Ministerial and Liberal candidates in the three Scotch counties of Argyshire, Ayrshire, and Lanarkshire—the two last the more remarkable as they were carried by the people against the whole influence of the powerful families of Eglinton and Hamilton.

It is, we think, impossible to deny that a very considerable change manifests itself in the spirit of the rural constituencies; and the cause of this change may easily be detected. As long as the system of protective duties on agricultural produce was held to be indispensable to the existence, or at least to the welfare, of the farmers,—as long as the farmers could be made to believe that their interest was identified with that of their landlords in the maintenance of this system, they readily gave their votes to that political party in the State which prolonged the duration, and resented the repeal, of the Corn Laws. The last Parliament was elected, as far at least as most of the rural constituencies were concerned, under the influence of this delusion, which Lord Derby and his followers found it convenient to keep alive, by ambiguous declarations, until after the election. The Parliament met; the doctrine of Protection was disavowed; the farmers got no redress for imaginary grievances, but they learned by experience that high prices and high farming are not incompatible with Free Trade. This question being disposed of, we may fairly ask what is now the substantial connexion between the interests or opinions of the Tory Party and the interests or opinions of the rural population? Have the landowners, farmers, and yeomen any reason to be opposed to an extension of the franchise, which must in the first instance place themselves more nearly on a footing of equality with the 10*l*. borough voters? Are they peculiarly solicitous for the maintenance of Church Rates in their present form? Are they not the chief sufferers by the legal burdens on the transfer and hypothecation of land and by the Law of Settlement? Would they not be the chief gainers by many of the practical reforms which it is incumbent on an efficient administration to propose and

carry? It is obvious that the work of improvement has even more to accomplish in the rural districts of Great Britain and Ireland than in the towns; and that the interests of the agricultural population rightly understood demand, not a stupid and impassive resistance to every species of change, but an enlightened concern on the part of the Legislature for the progress and amelioration of that important portion of the nation. These truths will gradually make their way, for they are based on the interest of the farmers themselves. And now that the artificial connexion established by the Corn Laws between the Tory Party and the agricultural interest is removed, we have no doubt that the ancient Whig principles, which predominated in the English counties during a considerable portion of the last century, will slowly but surely regain their ascendancy.

We do not profess to have formed any accurate estimate at the present moment, and within a few days of the actual returns, of the gain and loss to parties in this contest. Indeed we are satisfied that until the New Parliament shall have met, and recorded some votes, it will be impossible to calculate the real effect of the dissolution, though it cannot be less than a gain of forty votes to the Government. It is certain that an almost unprecedented number of changes have taken place in the representation: we believe upwards of 180 seats are filled either by new men, or by men representing different constituencies; and on either side adherence to the existing Government, given on very different grounds by different classes of candidates, has been found the best passport to the House of Commons. No real political excitement can be said to have manifested itself throughout the election, except that which led to the destruction of the Manchester and Peelite factions. Local influences were perhaps more strongly felt than is good for the Supreme Council of the nation, since it is puerile to seek in a Member of Parliament the qualifications of a Town Councillor. But upon the whole, considerable anxiety has been manifested to obtain the services of able, independent, working representatives; and a very large body of younger and more energetic men have been returned. They are entering on public life with high hopes and with honourable confidence; and we trust that among them will be found not a few who may be capable of bearing their part in the arduous but glorious duties of the Executive Government of this great empire. But to classify them in parties before they have contracted any political engagements beyond the loose declarations of the canvass or the hustings, or to judge of their future career by the standard of a vote given on an incidental question in a

former Parliament, is evidently premature and unjust. Neither can the vague title of 'Liberal' be construed with any precise meaning as applied to many of these individuals. We have seen Liberals so liberal that they have voted fifty or sixty times in a single session against the only ministers by whom the duties of a Liberal Administration can be carried on; and we have heard of others, who, though they occupy the foremost rank of Conservative benches, seem to think that the only effectual means of supplanting the present Cabinet is to outbid its schemes of Reform. From this state of things no theoretical inferences can be drawn, but we await with confidence the practical result.

We anticipate that the new Parliament, elected as it will be at a season peculiarly free from influences either fanatical or democratical, and springing from an outburst of healthy English feeling, will be at once liberal and moderate, friendly to practical improvements, and averse to sweeping, organic changes. We also hope for some improvement in party-discipline. A heavy blow has been struck at that crotchety and useless class of politicians, who, being perplexed with uneasy consciences, insist upon viewing every question on its abstract merits, rather, as Thucydides says, as if they were listening to the disputes of sophists, than as if they were deliberating concerning the state. It is now clearly perceived by every one, that a vote of the House of Commons is something more than the mere affirmative or negative of the proposition before it; that it is also a great political event, to be estimated by the premises on which the conclusion is supported, and the practical results which must follow it. Men who refuse to look at practical questions from this practical point of view, have mistaken their vocation when they enter public life, and should seek out some occupation in which the habitual sacrifice of individual conviction to objects more general and more remote, is not an indispensable condition of success.

We trust, also, that some check has been given to the undue readiness of men of views and principles so opposite as to render it impossible for them to combine in forming a Government, to unite together for its destruction. If things are to go on as they have done during the last Parliament, the most vital point of our Constitution—the existence of a government responsible to the House of Commons, will be endangered. The power of displacing governments is virtually placed in that body, but it is a power that can only be retained on condition that it be not grossly abused. If governments are to be displaced by a coalition of parties unable to replace them, the change will be constant, and

the country, wearied of the disgraceful struggle, will insist on some more permanent tenure of power by the Executive than the capricious will of an assembly ever ready to be influenced by turbulent and unscrupulous candidates for office. Nor is this an imaginary evil. In the United States, the Executive holds power, not at the will of the Legislature, but for a fixed term of four years; so that it frequently happens that the affairs of the country are administered by men who are utterly distrusted by Congress, and by the nation. Yet this evil is submitted to, rather than endure the instability which would result from constant changes, brought about by unscrupulous coalitions, such as we have just witnessed.

We entertain no apprehension that a Parliament thus elected and thus constituted will be liable to be hurried into precipitate or violent measures. On the contrary, whilst the ringleaders of faction have received a merited chastisement, and some of the less honourable names of the late House of Commons have happily been expunged from the new Parliament, we already perceive many valuable additions to the strength of the Legislature from men who have been elected, not for their proficiency in the arts of political agitation, but for their good sense, their habits of business, and their genuine attachment to the Liberal cause. The end of all representative institutions is neither more nor less than to select and constitute an Assembly from which the advisers of the Crown shall be taken, and by which the Executive Government shall be assisted and controlled. The public interest demands that such an Assembly shall include the ablest and most energetic spirits of the age, of every shade of opinion, both because the collision of such minds is the life of Parliament, and because their influence is far more safe and useful within the walls of Parliament than elsewhere. On this ground we have no desire to witness the permanent exclusion of any man, whatever be his political opinions, who has played an active and conscientious part in public affairs. All of them represent some of the miscellaneous interests and opinions of English society, which the House of Commons ought impartially to reflect. With the exception of some conspicuous names which are condemned to pay the penalty of their past errors, such we take to be the composition of the New Parliament. The instrument is apparently an excellent one, and it awaits the hand of a skilful and experienced leader. The country has nobly done its part. It has responded without hesitation to the appeal of Lord Palmerston, and given its confidence to his administration without reserve. The responsibility of the Minister is, therefore, proportionate to the confidence of the

nation. Armed with these powers, supported by these votes, Lord Palmerston is enabled, not only to maintain the proud position in which he has placed this country in its foreign relations, but also to deal with several momentous questions of domestic policy. It is at once his duty and his interest to take the lead in giving the greatest degree of efficiency to his government, since the dangers he has to fear lie not in the attitude of his ostensible opponents, but in the designs of those who seek to supplant him in the leadership of the Liberal party. That honourable position we are satisfied that he will not tamely allow any man to wrest from him. The union of the Liberal party is its strength: and, although it may be thrown into division and disorder when it halts in its progress, the Minister who guides and accompanies its steady advance is invincible.

NOTE TO PAGE 266.

Parliamentary Committees and Railway Legislation.

WE have received from Lord Redesdale, the Chairman of Committees of the House of Lords, a letter in reply to the observations we felt called upon to make in the last Number of this Journal, on several transactions connected with the private business of Parliament, in which he took a prominent part; and although his Lordship has thought it necessary to draw largely on our space, and on the indulgence of our readers, we do not hesitate to depart in this instance from our ordinary practice, and to publish his explanation of these transactions, out of deference to the office he holds.

‘London, February 17th, 1857.

‘SIR,—In the article on Parliamentary Committees and Railway Legislation in the last number of the Edinburgh Review, the writer states that “in many transactions connected with the private business of the House of Lords, the Chairman of Committees is found deficient in the qualities of judicial impartiality and absolute disinterestedness in the results, which the position he fills imperiously requires.” A heavier charge could not be brought against any one holding that office. Had it been confined to the above quoted general assertion, I must and should have been contented to treat with silent contempt an accusation which I could only meet by an indignant denial; but as the reviewer proceeds to support the charge by stating the cases on which he relies to prove it, I feel it no less due to my own honour, than to the House which has appointed me to the office, to notice them in detail; and I am sure that you will not refuse a public man the sole redress which it is in your power to grant him, after having allowed his character to be grossly assailed in the Review of which you are the editor, by inserting this

letter in your next Number, in order that all those who have read the attack may have the same opportunity of reading its refutation.

The first complaint is directed against certain decisions of the Standing Orders Committee of the Lords. It is stated as of no unusual occurrence, that when a Bill has passed the Commons, and the promoters are sanguine as to its ultimate success, they are suddenly startled by "a letter from the Parliamentary Agents, to say that Lord Redesdale decides that the subscription contract is not properly attested, or will not allow the amended section adopted by the House of Commons, or something else which is just about as substantial a reason for rejecting a Bill, and wasting the 20,000*l.* which has been spent upon it, as a discovery that six of the directors have "red hair." Two cases are quoted in proof of this charge, the Belfast and County Down Railway, in 1854, and the Aberdeen, Peterhead, and Fraserburgh Railway, in 1856.

Of the first, the reviewer says that the promoters had made a mistake in the deposited section, which the Committee of the Commons had allowed to be corrected by the deposit of an amended section, and the Bill passed that House, but was thrown out in the Standing Orders Committee of the Lords "on the very same sectional objection which had been treated by the Commons as immaterial except in point of form, as unquestionably it was."

The whole of this statement as to the cause of the rejection of the Bill is untrue. It was not on account of a mistake in the section, but because the declaration on which the Bill was introduced was found to be incorrect. When a company desires to execute a new work, and has surplus funds at its disposal, it is allowed to substitute a declaration setting forth the amount of such surplus for a new subscription contract. The declaration of the Belfast and County Down Railway set forth that the directors had 400,000*l.* surplus under their control, which they calculated on the following basis:—The original share capital was 500,000*l.*, of which only 266,000*l.* had been raised and expended, leaving a balance of 234,000*l.*; and as they were allowed under their former Act to borrow 166,000*l.*, these two sums together made up the 400,000*l.* But the Committee, on investigating the case, found that as the whole of the capital had not been subscribed for, the power to borrow did not exist; and that as in the Bill power was given to issue all the remaining shares with a preference, because up to that time no one had been found willing to take them without one, it was clear that not even the 234,000*l.* unraised share capital was under the control of the directors at the time when the declaration was made. In fact, instead of having 400,000*l.* under their control, they had not as many shillings; and to have admitted such a declaration as sufficient, would have sanctioned a gross deception, and established a most dangerous precedent.

It is important to notice the effect on part of the argument of the reviewer produced by the fact of the Lords' decision before the Standing Orders Committee having been upon the declaration, and not upon the section, and which, as will be seen hereafter, applies equally to the other case quoted by him of the Aberdeen, Peterhead,

and Fraserburgh Railway. The Standing Orders Committees of both Houses try all objections to the accuracy of sections, and a difference in decision is consequently a difference of opinion between the Committees on the same point, though possibly not on the same evidence. But as regards declarations and subscription contracts, the Standing Orders Committee of the Commons only decide upon the accuracy of their form, leaving the inquiry as to their sufficiency in other respects to the Committees on the Bills. In the Lords, this latter point is also investigated by the Standing Orders Committee, and their decision therefore in both these cases was taken on a question not entered into by the Standing Orders Committee of the Commons. In my judgment, the practice of the House of Lords in this matter is the best. The questions arising on subscription contracts and declarations rest on general principles, equally affecting all schemes, and altogether distinct from the merits of any. They are therefore better tried before one and the same tribunal, whose practice upon them becomes uniform, than if subjected to the variety of decisions likely to be obtained from the different Committees to whom the several Bills are submitted.

‘In the next Standing Orders case brought against me, the Aberdeen, Peterhead, and Fraserburgh Railway, it is stated that the Bill was lost “before Lord Redesdale and the Standing Orders Committee *on the sole ground*, according to the ‘*Railway Times*,’ that the “signatures of some of the parties were not attested in the form “required by the Standing Orders.” It will be noticed that the reviewer makes this and other statements, which are untrue, on the authority of a newspaper, and not as of his own knowledge. Now to the facts of the case. The subscription contract was for 261,170*l.*, of which 10,000*l.* was subscribed by Mr. John Duncan, solicitor for the bill, on his own account, and 110,000*l.* by the same Mr. Duncan “in respect of the guarantee of Lord Saltoun for 50,000*l.*, of Sir Alexander Bannerman for 30,000*l.*, and “of Mr. Gordon for 30,000*l.*” It was admitted by Mr. Duncan before the Committee that the guarantee of Lord Saltoun was only for 5,000*l.*, and those of Sir Alexander Bannerman and Mr. Gordon for 3,000*l.* each, though he had represented them as for 50,000*l.*, 30,000*l.*, and 30,000*l.* respectively. That this fraud was the real cause of the Committee refusing to allow the Bill to proceed is clear from their report, which, after setting forth that the Standing Orders had not been complied with in regard to the attestation, proceeds as follows:—“The Committee further report that the guarantees in “respect of which Mr. Duncan subscribed his name in the schedule “were verbal assurances from Lord Saltoun for 5,000*l.*, from Sir “Alexander Bannerman for 3,000*l.*, and from Mr. Gordon for “3,000*l.*, while from the manner in which they are mentioned it is “made to appear that they were for 50,000*l.*, 30,000*l.*, and 30,000*l.* “respectively; and the Committee are of opinion that the entries so “made are of a character to mislead the other subscribers and the “public as to the support given to the scheme by those persons.” When this decision was given, the agent for the Bill asked whether

his client might be allowed to re-execute the deed, and lodge a supplemental one, and was informed by the Committee that, *after the special report made, no favour could be shown to that contract.* With these facts before him, the reviewer has ventured to charge me and the Standing Orders Committee with having thrown out the Bill on the sole ground of defective attestation, and to have been guilty of a gratuitous display of arbitrary power.

‘I now proceed to the charge brought against me in regard to the Oxford, Worcester, and Wolverhampton Railway.

‘In 1854 that company had a Bill before Parliament, and I was informed that their counsel, in his opening speech before the Committee of the Commons, had made a violent attack upon me. I went immediately to the Committee-room, and requested him to call me as a witness, declaring myself ready to submit to any examination and cross-examination as to my conduct in the matters he complained of. He declined to do so, and having given to the Committee an explanation of the charges brought against me, I went my way. The Chairman (Lord Stanley) afterwards assured me that the Committee were perfectly satisfied that the charge of improper conduct was groundless. The same attack was made before the Lords’ Committee, and was met by me in the same manner, and I received a similar assurance from the Chairman (the Duke of Northumberland) to that which I had from Lord Stanley. I thus met the charge boldly and publicly when made, and was acquitted in the opinion of those before whom it was brought.

‘And now as to the charge itself. In 1852, seven years after the Oxford, Worcester, and Wolverhampton Act was obtained, a portion of the line still had only a single line of rails, by which passenger-trains were subjected to frequent stoppages, and the full development of the traffic was prevented. The company having a Bill before Parliament, I inquired when the double line of rails might be expected to be completed, and they named a time. I insisted on the insertion of a clause subjecting them to a penalty if the work was not done within the time so fixed by themselves. That the object sought to be secured was for the public benefit no one can deny, and that I was right in believing that the Company could not be trusted to do the work voluntarily, is proved by the fact that it is not done yet. The clause was inserted. The following year they came for an extension of time. The Bill was opposed by the Great Western, and the Committee to whom it was referred made a material alteration in the above-mentioned provision, at their instigation. The counsel for the O. W. W. Company, in the attack he made on me in 1854, endeavoured to make it appear that I was the cause of the success obtained on that occasion by the Great Western; but it was admitted by his own witness that I objected to the clauses then introduced, and suggested others which were preferred by the O. W. W., but objected to by the Committee; thus clearly showing that the position in which they stood in 1854 was the result of the decision of that Committee, of which the Earl of Chichester was Chairman, in opposition to my opinion and wishes.

‘The reviewer considers that I am interested in the line to an extent which disqualifies me from acting impartially in any matters relating to it. I deny altogether that I have any other interest in it than that which an Irishman has in the North Western, or a Scot in the Great Northern, viz., that they constantly use them. I have no personal object to serve, but what is common to every traveller upon it. Probably the real cause of objection to me is, that I know too much about the concern. If I had known as much of many other companies it would have been far better both for the public and the shareholders.

‘I have now to treat of the O. W. W. Bill of last session. As it came from the Commons it proposed to secure (1st) an extension of time, (2nd) the raising a large sum by preference shares, (3rd) the capitalization of existing and future arrears of dividend, and (4th) the issue of deferred dividend warrants bearing interest. I conceived it to be my duty to take the opinion of my advising Committee on the three last provisions. Indulgence was recommended in regard to the issue of preference shares, if the Committee on the Bill should think fit, on the ground that the Company was then subject to the penalty for non-completion, constituting, in fact, a pre-preference of 18,000*l.* a-year, from which they could not escape but by an outlay of money which they could not raise except by a grant of pre-preference. The third and fourth propositions were of course reported against as inadmissible on principle. The Bill was sent with this report to a Committee. The reviewer says that, in fact, I appoint these committees. He knows that four other Peers share this duty with me — the Duke of Richmond, the Earl of Besborough, Lord Colchester, and Lord Stanley of Alderley, — some of whom always assist in choosing them, and give great attention to the subject. The care taken in forming the Committee in question, to exclude all persons supposed to be prejudiced in favour of the Great Western, led us into error the other way; and so far from the O. W. W. having to complain, the Peers composing it proved, though perfectly honourable, to have so strong a bias in favour of the narrow gauge, as to subject our choice to just comment from the Great Western. So much for my unfair dealing against the former company. But, says the reviewer, “the ‘Railway Times’ exulted over them as having Lord Redesdale’s ‘broad gauge clauses forced into two of their Bills.’” Here, again, I find the newspaper quoted as the authority for an assertion, which the writer does not like to make as from himself. There were no broad gauge clauses in either of the Bills. The two companies had agreed before the Board of Trade that, except in regard to an extension of time, the *status quo* of each should be strictly preserved. Care was, therefore, taken in framing the clauses that this engagement should be adhered to, but no clause was inserted giving the Great Western any advantage whatever, — and the writer ought not to have been ignorant of these facts.

‘I have now gone through all the charges of partial and interested behaviour brought against me by the reviewer, and have shown that some are untrue altogether, and others by the suppres-

sion of truth and the suggestion of untruth. The only matter which remains for me to notice is what he states in regard to the appointment of the Chairman's Committee; "the effect of which," he says, "has been exactly what every person knew that it would be, and "was intended to be, viz. to arm Lord Redesdale with even greater "powers than he had before."

'That directors who have acted, or who desire to act, illegally in regard to the affairs of the company entrusted to their charge, should dislike this Committee is natural, and from such a person, or from some follower, this attack most probably comes. The object I had in desiring the appointment of this Committee was stated by me when I proposed it to the House. I had found provisions in various Bills legalising most objectionable acts of directors, granting pre-preference without the consent of those affected by it, sanctioning the issue of dividend warrants bearing interest, or the borrowing money to pay dividends, and for other equally improper purposes, and that the promoters were almost universally successful in carrying them. If the Bill was opposed, it was very rarely so on these points, and a Committee can seldom be induced to attend properly to any provisions which are not objected to in the petitions referred to them; and if it was opposed on these points, or if the Committee inquired into them, though unopposed, the case was never fairly brought before them. The objection to these things rests on principle, and any counsel who might attempt to argue against them on such grounds would have his own speech in some other case in which he had advocated their adoption quoted against him by his opponent; and the Committees were further embarrassed by the number of precedents quoted for similar concessions, which were accumulating every session. If the Bill was really unopposed, to prevent its coming in regular course before me, a fictitious opposition was frequently got up. Under these circumstances I advised the House to appoint a Committee, on whom it could rely, to report on any provision in a Private Bill on which the Chairman of Committees thought it desirable that the House should receive such information before it passed. The reviewer admits that "it consists of some of the ablest members of the House;" and the names of the Duke of Somerset, the Earl of Stradbroke, Lord Colchester, Lord Portman, and Lord Stanley of Alderley (the majority not being even taken from my own political friends), must preclude any one who knows anything on the subject from believing for a moment that I intended, through their means, to secure to myself any authority which could be exercised contrary to the public advantage. Directors and others interested in the continuance of railway jobs see in this Committee a death-blow to their iniquities, and it is not surprising that one of them should be found to cry out against it. The reviewer says, that "it was not long in falling into "one of those mistakes which the cleverest men in the world cannot "avoid when they undertake to decide causes without hearing "them;" but he omits to quote the case, for the best possible reason, —because there is none.

'This Committee reported on three Bills, recommending certain

points to the particular consideration of the Committees on them in two cases, and desiring the objectionable clauses in the O. W. W. to be struck out, as before mentioned. One Bill only, the Norfolk Railway, they recommended should not be allowed to proceed. The preamble of this Bill stated that the Wells and Fakenham Railway having been unable to raise the whole of the funds necessary for the construction of the railway, certain directors of the Norfolk Railway, *acting on behalf of the Company*, subscribed for 1500 shares (30,000*l.*), in the Wells and Fakenham: that the Norfolk Company *afterwards* approved of and adopted such subscription, and that all calls hitherto made on the said shares *had been paid out of the corporate funds of the Norfolk Company*, and that it was expedient that the said shares should be transferred into the name of the Norfolk Company, and that the application of their corporate funds to the payment of the calls on such shares should be authorised and sanctioned. The report of the Committee states that "The Committee find that the directors of the Norfolk Railway Company subscribed for the said shares in the month of December, 1853; that it is incorrectly stated in the preamble that the directors acted in behalf of the company in subscribing for the said shares, as the sanction of the company had never been obtained to such subscription; that in the Bill brought into Parliament in 1854 no mention was made of the fact that the directors had so subscribed, although the notices published of the intention to apply for that Bill would have enabled the promoters thereof to insert provisions therein sanctioning the course pursued by the directors; that no attempt was made during the year 1855 to obtain the sanction of Parliament to the transaction; that prior to a meeting of the shareholders held on the 15th July 1855, it was not stated in any printed report of the proceedings of the directors that such a subscription had been entered into; that the advertisements convening the said meeting of the shareholders on the 15th July 1855, did not state that the meeting was held for the purpose of considering the said subscription by the directors, but merely to consider certain arrangements to be entered into with the Wells and Fakenham Railway Company; that all calls hitherto made on the said shares, amounting to more than one half of the amount subscribed for, have been paid out of the corporate funds of the company by the directors, who were well aware that they had no legal right to make such payments, or to ask for and obtain from the shareholders any vote apparently sanctioning such payments."

"The agents for the Bill were ~~heard~~ before the Committee, and the facts and dates in the report were ~~taken~~ from their statements and admissions. Several applications were made to me afterwards to allow the Bill to proceed, but in none of those communications to me was it asserted that we had been misinformed on, or had misunderstood, the facts of the case.

"The reviewer dislikes the control exercised over Bills by the Chairman of Committees. It is undoubtedly great, but I should fail in my duty to the House and to the public if I hesitated to de-

clare it indispensable that it should be so, in order to secure something like uniformity of practice, and to prevent the enactment of great enormities through the means of Private Bills. The power of the Chairman rests altogether on the confidence which the House places in the honesty and discretion of the Peer chosen to fill that most important office. The reviewer has sought to diminish that power. I thank him, for I feel that both with the House and the public the authority derived from a firm and impartial discharge of my duties will be increased by his attack. He has said the worst he could of me, without being even particular as to truth, and has totally failed to establish a case against me on any point. He is compelled to admit that "my services would be useful to the public," and that I should be the right man in the right place, if I was put "under proper control, and it was intimated to me that my authority "was entrusted to me for the benefit of the public;" and he further pays me the very high compliment of "acknowledging that my administration of my department is in many respects an improvement "on that of my predecessor, Lord Shaftesbury." I tell him that I am always under proper control; under the control of the House, of public opinion, and above all, of my own conscience, which assures me that my authority has never been exercised but for what I sincerely believed to be the public good; and that I decline all compliments from one who evidently considers that official experience and aptitude for business would well excuse a little dishonesty.

'I send this letter in full time to enable the reviewer to see it and to deny anything that I have stated in it, if he can. I must, however, request that you will not admit a reply which enters into new matter or argument. He had his choice when he wrote the article, and selected, of course, those cases which he considered the strongest against me. The high character of your Review appeared to me to require a notice from me of such an attack, or at all events enabled me to notice it without lowering myself; but I cannot continue a contest with an anonymous assailant.

'I have the honour to be,

'Sir,

'Your obedient Servant,

'REDESDALE.

'To the Editor of the EDINBURGH REVIEW.'

The tone of this communication is not precisely what we should have expected from such an antagonist, but Lord Redesdale is the best judge of the manner in which it becomes him to repel criticisms on the discharge of his public duties, and we shall not imitate his Lordship by affecting an acrimony which we do not feel. In truth, the remarks of which he conceives himself to be entitled to complain were not dictated by any want of personal consideration for himself, or by the remotest interest in the transactions to which we referred by way of example. But we hold it to be a matter of real public interest that the property of the nation should not be wasted by this clumsy, anomalous, and often irresponsible procedure; that the

proceedings of the Legislature on Private Bills should not be so confused and vexatious as to exclude the adoption of any uniform system; and that the conduct of those who take a part in these transactions should be as free from all suspicion of arbitrary power as if they wore the ermine of our courts of justice. For these reasons we believe it to be highly expedient that public opinion, as represented by an independent Press, should exercise a more active control over these subjects; and since Lord Redesdale has taken this opportunity to pass an encomium on what he terms his 'firm and 'impartial discharge of his duties,' we hope that this discussion will strengthen him in the performance of his legitimate functions, by reminding him that they cannot be exceeded with entire impunity.

The evidence, from which we borrowed the examples Lord Redesdale complains of, is to be found in the Minutes of the several Committees which have sat upon the rival Bills of these contending lines; and although copies of this evidence are made for the use of counsel and parties, these voluminous documents are not printed without a special order of the House. These materials not being before the public, it is not in his Lordship's power, or in our own, to verify either his or our version of these transactions by an appeal to printed records. Our statements were not made without a careful examination of this testimony; but we must decline to encumber our pages by a minute analysis of written evidence, which he himself, as Chairman of Committees, has not thought fit to print, although, as he himself states, this is not the first time that similar allegations have been made. To the public at large such topics must necessarily be uninviting; but we have the satisfaction of knowing that, to those who are professionally conversant with the business of 'Parliamentary Committees and Railway Legislation,' the justice of our strictures is sufficiently apparent.

I N D E X.

A

- Afghanistan*, English expedition into, 270, *et seq.*—notice of Afghanistan as a state, 274—its internal policy, 275.
- Africa*, Spanish conquests in the North of, 11.
- Air*, importance of the amount and purity of, in prolonging life, 69.
- Alexander the Great*, Mr. Grote's character of, 308, *et seq.*—his five chroniclers, 308-9—his history, 314, *et seq.*
- Alva*, Duke of, and his government of the Netherlands, 28.
- Architecture*, review of Fergusson's 'Handbook' of, 112—architecture of past generations, 112—India, 116—three primitive types of architectural development, 120—architecture of China, 123—of Egypt, 124—of Greece, 127—of Rome, 131—Gothic, 132—theory of the dome, 138—definition of architecture, 139—future English styles, 140.
- Arrian*, remarks on his account of Alexander the Great, 308, *et seq.*
- Assaye*, General Wellesley's account of the battle of, 410.
- Assurances, Life*, origin and growth of, 55.
- Athanasius*, Festal Letters of, 433, *et seq.*
- Atlantic Ocean*, physical geography of the, 360—the Atlantic electric telegraph, 383.
- Auto-de-fé* of Valladolid, 24-5.

B

- Bailey*, Thomas, review of his 'Records of Longevity,' 46, *et seq.*
- Barante*, M. de, review of his 'Histoire du Directoire de la République Française,' 205, *et seq.*
- Belgium* under Spain, compared with the Belgium of our own times, 12.
- Boswell*, Letters of, review of the, 456, *et seq.*—history of the publication of the letters, 458—review of 'Boswelliana,' 460—sketch of the life of Boswell, 461.
- Boyne*, battle of the, 156—the MS. in the Littlecote collection relating to the, 156.
- Braufield*, Lord Justice Clerk, anecdotes of, 234, *et seq.*—his charge on Muir's Trial, 237, *note.*

C

- Carlos, Don*, son of Philip II. of Spain, 30.
- Carstairs*, and Scotch affairs, 168.
- Catherine de Medicis*, her character, 35.
- Census*, the, of the United Kingdom, 55—the, of *Vespasian*, 60—the, of the United States, 61-2—quinquennial, of *France*, 642.

- China*, architecture of, 123—British relations with, 518, *et seq.*—the quarrel with Yeh, 519—Chinese character, 527—and civilisation, 530.
- Clark*, Dr. George, notice of, 156—his MS. on the war in Ireland preserved at Littlecote, 156.
- Cockburn*, Henry, review of his 'Memorials of his Time,' 218, *et seq.*—personal notices of him, 220, *et seq.*
- Conington*, John, M.A., review of his 'Academical Study of Latin,' 493.
- Convocation*, review of works relating to, 78—possible consequences of the reassumption of the functions of, 78-106—incompetence of, 85—right of the laity to a voice in the decisions of, 90-91—proceedings of the Convocations of 1854, 5, and 6, 97-100—suggestions for diocesan synods, 102.
- Cureton*, William, M.A., review of his 'Festal Letters of Athanasius,' 433.
- Curtius*, Quintus, his account of Alexander the Great, 309, *et seq.*
- Curzon*, Hon. Robert, his visit to the Convent of the Valley of the Natron Lake, 441.

D

- Dilettanti* Society, notices of the, 493, *et seq.*
- Diodorus*, his account of Alexander the Great, 309, *et seq.*
- Directory*, French, state of society under the, 205, *et seq.*
- Divorce*, review of works relating to, 181—the bill of 1856, 182—divorce in the early Christian Church, 183—and since the Reformation, 183-4—M. de Portalis on Divorce in the Conseil d'Etat, 185—public opinion respecting, 187—grounds for obtaining, 188.
- Ducancel*, M., his play of 'Les Aristides Modernes,' 208-10.

E

- Egypt*, architecture of, 124.
- Elizabeth*, Queen of England, and Philip II. of Spain, 6-7.
- England*, causes of her success in establishing a free government, 16—her policy and destiny compared with that of Spain, 32—human longevity in, 63—'History of,' by the Right Hon. T. B. Macaulay, reviewed, 142.
- Exercises* of the body, in respect to longevity, considered, 72.
- Exeter*, bishop of, and his synod.
- Fergusson*, James, review of his 'Illustrated Handbook of Architecture,' &c., 112, *et seq.*
- Ferrier*, J. P., review of his 'Caravan Journeys and Wanderings in Persia, Afghanistan, Turkistan, and Beloochistan,' &c., 266, *et seq.*
- Flanders*, state of, under Spanish rule, 3.
- France*, review of his 'De la Longévité Humaine, et de la Vie sur le Globe,' 46, *et seq.*

Food, remarks on, in connexion with longevity, 70—71.

France, and Philip II. of Spain, 8-9—her vicissitudes and inconsistencies of the last three centuries, 13-15—her policy and destiny compared with that of Spain, 34—state of French society under the Directory, 205, *et seq.*—remarks on the quinquennial census of the French empire, 342, *et seq.*—rural emigration to Paris, 344—French speculation on the Bourse, 345—slow rate of increase of the population, 349—and its consequences, 351—rise of the price of lodgings and rents in Paris, 353—numerical strength of the population of the empire, 356—taxes in the towns and taxes in the country, 358—conscription, 358.

G

Gaza, siege of, by Alexander the Great, 336.

Gludstone, Right Hon. W. E., his character, 560.

Glencoe, Mr. Macaulay's account of the massacre of, 170—the real history of the affair, 171.

Goncourt, Messrs. de, review of their 'Histoire de la Société Française pendant le Directoire,' 205, *et seq.*

Greece, architecture of, 127.

Grote, George, Esq., review of his 'History of Greece,' 305.

Gulf Stream, Lieut. Maury's account of the, 370.

H

Henry IV. of France, his character and policy, 36.

Herat, siege of, in 1837, 284—ascendancy of Persia at, 286—treaty of Colonel Sheil, 288—rebellion in, 295—march of the Persians on, 297—besieged and taken by the Persians, 300.

Hong Kong, its defects as a colony, 540.

Horner, Francis, and Sydney Smith, 240-1.

Husband and Wife, rights and liabilities of, 181, *et seq.*

Husson, Alfred, review of his 'Les Consommations de Paris,' 342.

I

India, architecture of, 116—affairs of, 266. 400, *et seq.*—trade of, in opium, 544.

Inquisition, the, in Spain, 25-6—the holy office abolished in the Netherlands, 27.

Ireland, events in, at the beginning of the reign of William III., 155, *et seq.*

Johnson, Dr. Samuel, and James Boswell, 457, *et seq.*

Jones, Sir Harford, his mission to Persia, 408.

Justin, his account of Alexander the Great, 309, *et seq.*

K

Kames, Lord, anecdote of, 235.

Kane, Dr., review of his 'Arctic Explorations in the years 1843, 1844, and 1845,' 360.

Kaye, John William, review of his 'Life and Correspondence of Sir John Malcolm, G.C.B.,' &c., 391, *et seq.*

Kerhallet, Philippe de, review of his 'Considérations Générales sur l'Océan Atlantique,' 360.

L

Letters, Revival of, and the Christianity of the 15th Century, 18-19.

Littlecote, Dr. George Clark's MS. on the war in Ireland preserved at, 156.

Longevity, Human, review of works relating to, 46, *et seq.*—hypothesis respecting the elements of life and the constant quantity of life on the globe, 48-9—speculative doctrines of the measure of life, 50-1—epiphysis, 51-2—instances of longevity, 52-3—longevity, desirable or not? 75.

M

Macaulay, the Right Hon. T. B., review of his 'History of England,' 142.

Macedonia, Mr. Grote's treatment of the history of, 306—ethnical relation between the Greek and Macedonian people, 317.

Macqueen's 'Rights and Liabilities of Husband and Wife' reviewed, 181.

Mai, Cardinal, and the Festal Letters of Athanasius, 433.

Malcolm, Sir John, review of *Kaye's* 'Life' of, 391, *et seq.*—personal notices of him, 392, *et seq.*—his career, 399, *et seq.*

'*Mar de Sargasso*,' remarks on the, 375.

Mary, Queen of William III. of England, 153.

Maury, Lieut., review of his 'Physical Geography of the Sea,' 360, *et seq.*

Meadows, M. S. Taylor, review of, his 'Chinese and their Rebellions,' 518, *et seq.*

Motley, J. L., review of his 'Rise of the Dutch Republic,' 1, *et seq.* See *Philip II.*

Murray, Hon. C., sent to Teheran, 293—his departure, and its causes, 296-7.

N

Natron Lakes, valley of the, and the ascetics, 438.

Netherlands, the, under Spain, and the Netherlands of our own time, contrasted, 12—rebellion and the reformation in, 26, *et seq.*

Norton, Mrs., her 'Letter to the Duke of Devonshire' reviewed, 181.

Opium trade, considerations on the, 544.

Oven, B. Van, M.D., review of his 'Decline of Life in Health and Disease,' 46, *et seq.*

P

Pacho, M., his Syrian MSS., 445.

Palmerston, Lord, and the Parliament of 1857, 562, *et seq.*

Paoli, General, 467.

Parliament of 1852, review of the, 552—causes of the dissolution of the, 558—the new parliament, 571.

Parliamentary Committees and *Railway Legislation*, 242, *et seq.*—letter from Lord Redesdale respecting the article on, 578.

Persepolis, destruction of the palace of, by Alexander the Great, 337.

Persia, India, and Afghanistan, 266, *et seq.*—ascendency of Persia, at Herat, 286—treaty obtained by Colonel Sheil, 288—the outrage on the British mission, 291—Persia and Russia, 292, *et seq.*—the 'Mrs. Hashem affair,' 296—departure of Mr. Murray, 297—siege and capture of Herat, 300—war declared by Great Britain against Persia, 301—Malcolm's 'History of the Persian Monarchy,' 406.

'*Philip II.* and his 'Times,' by W. H. Prescott,' review of, 1—Philip's dominions, 2-3—his character 4-5—his connexion with England, 6-9. See *Spain*.

Piron, and the French troops in India, 404.

Plutarch, his account of Alexander the Great, 309, *et seq.*

Prescott, W. H., review of his 'History of the Reign of Philip II.,' 1, *et seq.* See *Philip II.*

Railway Legislation, 242, *et seq.* See *Parliamentary Committees*.

R

Redesdale, Lord, and the Standing Order Committee of the House of Lords, 256, *et seq.*—letter from, to the Edinburgh Review, 578.

Roumania, present condition of, 419—question of the union of the Principalities, 420—characteristics of the Rouman race, 421—General Kisseleff's organisation of the provinces, 424—our opinion of the Roumans, 425—the proposed system of government, 426—Rouman peasantry, 428.

Russell, Lord John, and the Chinese question, 566.

S

Schomberg, Duke of, his death, as narrated by Dr. George Clark, 157.

Scotland, condition of, and events in, at the commencement of the reign of William III., 162, *et seq.*

Scottish Lawyers and English critics, 218, *et seq.*

Spain, in the 15th and 16th centuries, 1, *et seq.*—state of Spain at the death of Philip II., 7-9—causes of the decline of the power of Spain, 10, *et seq.*—compared with Belgium, the Netherlands, France, and England, 12-16—the policy and destiny of Spain, England, and France, compared, 16, *et seq.* See *Philip II.*

Syriac MSS., collection of, in the British Museum, 434.

Syud Mahomed, of Herat, 289—killed, 295.

T

Tattam, Dr., and the Syrian MS. of Athanasius, 442.

Thirlwall, Bishop, his fairness in his 'History of Greece,' 373.

Thomson, Mr., and the British mission at Teheran, 291.

Tyre, conquest of, by Alexander the Great, 334.

W

Wellesley, Marquis of, and Indian affairs, 402, *et seq.*

Wellington, Duke of, and Sir John Malcolm, 395, *et seq.*

William III., King of England, portrait of, as drawn by Mr. Macaulay, 144—his landing, 145—his anxieties, 148—Queen Mary, 153—the battle of the Boyne, 156-7—William's measures for the suppression of the opposition of the Irish, 160—and of the Scotch, 168—his qualifications as a general and a diplomatist, 180.

William, Prince of Orange, and Philip II. of Spain, 26, *et seq.*

Women, married, and their rights of property, 191, *et seq.*

Y

Yar Mahomed of Herat, 284.

Yuzoof Khan of Herat, 295, *et seq.*

END OF VOL. CV.

